

Ennius and his friends

Autor(en): **Badian, E.**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique**

Band (Jahr): **17 (1972)**

PDF erstellt am: **25.06.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660877>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

Haftungsausschluss

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

IV

E. BADIAN

Ennius and his Friends

ENNIUS AND HIS FRIENDS

A discussion on Ennius is not really a promising place for a historian *qua* historian. First of all, unlike the study of (say) Vergil or Ovid in more recent times, the study of Ennius has never attracted the narrow and esoteric kind of literary specialist: from Colonna and Merula to scholars like Jocelyn, Suerbaum and Skutsch, those working in this field have invariably approached the subject in the only way in which it can properly be approached—from the broadest possible base of general Classical scholarship, as true *Philologen* (*dicti studiosi*). Hence it would be absurd for a professed historian to pontificate on relevant historical matters before colleagues who are as well informed about them as he is himself. The historian must himself become—as the best ancient historian always is, but even more profoundly so—*dicti studiosus*, making what contribution he can from (as it were) the inside, though inevitably against the background of his special training and interests.

Moreover, there is a singular scarcity of facts for the historian to work on. The ancient historian is never blessed with a superabundance of good evidence, but in this case Clio has been singularly ungenerous. For the historical background of Ennius' life Livy is our principal source; and Livy, like most of his annalistic predecessors, was more interested in the striking incident—battle, sedition, stirring oratory—than in the working of the political system of the age, with its constitutional conventions and its shifting and kaleidoscopic personal and family manoeuvring for power and position¹. Nor was it his aim—and by his day it could

¹ The most ambitious attempt to trace that working is H. H. SCULLARD, *Roman Politics 220-150 B. C.* (1951)—based on F. MÜNZER's classic *Röm. Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien* (1920). Scholars have been found to deny the nature of the working of the system, largely because Livy does not report it! See, e.g.,

perhaps no longer have been perfectly achieved even if it had been—to separate truth from myth, character from image. As for the life of a mere poet : no one cared enough about it to record any facts, and the scholars of the late Republic already had no solid ground under their feet except for what could be gleaned from the works themselves¹. For us, of course, the task is made infinitely harder by the tantalisingly fragmentary nature of those works. I shall therefore devote much of my time to trying to separate fact from fiction, in the full knowledge that the goal is beyond proper attainment : let it be stated at the outset, since it would be tedious to repeat it in each instance, that much of what I am going to say—like much of what the rest of us here have been saying—must rest on what subjectively seems the most reasonable interpretation of scattered tatters of evidence : pieces that others will think it more reasonable to combine in a different way. Even so, I hope that some points of interest, both positive and negative, may emerge and perhaps gain some acceptance ; though such has been the amount of care devoted to this field of study that I shall say little that has not been said in some form before ; indeed, those better versed in the long history of the scholarship of the subject may well find that it *all* has been. However,

C. MEIER, *Res Publica Amissa* (1966), 187 : “ Scullard, Syme und die Ihren haben nun diese These [of the manoeuvring of aristocratic politics] niemals aus den Quellen begründet, in denen von solchen Faktionen keine Silbe steht.”

¹ W. SUERBAUM, *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter* (1968), provides the most thorough and scholarly investigation of what we can thus glean, both directly and at second hand. He incidentally discusses all the points concerning Ennius' life (and nearly all those concerning Ennius' work) noted in my paper. My indebtedness to his careful collection of all relevant facts and to his sober judgments will appear (to the initiate) on every page and must here be gratefully recorded. I shall not in each case give particular references to his discussion, since his excellent index makes it readily accessible, and I need merely state, with due emphasis, that it should always be consulted ; as should his bibliography, which has often dispensed me from the need for extensive research and listing.

as one thing leads to another, we may find incidental gleanings by the wayside, which I shall feel quite free to pick as I come to them, even at the cost of a detour; and if the resulting product may perhaps be called a *satura*, the subject of our enquiry would not be one to have objected.

The solid facts that we know about the life of Quintus Ennius are very few, and the main ones are all too quickly listed: his date of birth, since he seems to have mentioned it in whatever book of the *Annals* it was that he wrote when he was sixty-seven¹; also his *patria* (presumably, although not necessarily, his actual place of birth) of Rudiae and his Messapic descent, which he again chose to record and others chose to preserve for us²; and we may add his gout, whether

¹ See VAHLEN, pp. CXCVI and 67 (with references to his earlier discussion); SUERBAUM, pp. 115 f. (bibliography p. 117³⁸¹), 133 f., 145. As is known, Gellius XVII 21, 43 quotes Varro as giving Ennius' date of birth and reporting that he himself stated this (it seems) in Book XII of the *Annals*, where he gave his age as his 67th year. It will appear below (pp. 176 f.) that book numbers transmitted by Gellius must not be lightly changed—but also that I agree with those who think a change in this instance essential. (Suerbaum too, I think, would make this the only such figure in Gellius that he admits must be changed.) Since Gellius (who certainly had access to a text) did not choose to check the statement in Ennius, his information here is at second hand and may have been corrupt when it reached him. It should be noted that he does not *pretend* to have checked—a point to be borne in mind, in his favour, where he quotes Ennius directly.

² *Ann.* 376 (Servius in *Aen.* VII 691), 377 (*nos sumus Romani, qui fuimus ante Rudini*) with Book XII, fr. IV. SUERBAUM (p. 325, App. 29) collects the various attempts that have been made to assign a home in the *Annals* to line 377. No one has ever proved that it (or, for that matter, 376) belongs anywhere in that work. The statement about his age (and the famous simile of the retired horse, 374-5) presumably stood at what he conceived of as the end of his work (Book XV, as Suerbaum has made plausible). It is the only purely personal statement securely assigned to the *Annals* (the literary controversy of the *prooemia* seems of a different nature, and irrelevant), and is both understandable and acceptable in its presumed place. For line 377 no such poetically proper place can be found; while there is no objection whatever to placing it in the *Satires*. It follows (*i.a.*) that the line is irrelevant to the date of composition of the *Annals*.

or not he died of it¹. We know that he accompanied M. Fulvius Nobilior, the consul of 189, to Aetolia and celebrated his achievements there, to Cato's disgust²; and there are no doubt one or two minor points one might add. But we soon enter the realm of legend and error, e.g.—as we shall see—with the story that he received the Roman citizenship as a reward from M. Fulvius' younger son³; and even the date of his death, attested by Varro, cannot be regarded as absolutely certain, as Münzer pointed out long ago⁴.

But it is not mere dearth of fact that is conspicuous—it is the growth of distortion and legend, only too often accepted to this day. We all know how Cicero's cautious statement, in the context of a case, that Ennius' statue was *said* to be in the tomb of the Scipios was soon inflated, only a generation later, into positive assertion—and it may well be that Cicero himself already knew it as such and rejected it⁵; a little later still, we hear⁶ that the great Scipio had

¹ Attested in *Satires*, line 64, from which his death of the disease was most probably deduced (Hieronym. *Chron.*, s.a. 1849: *articulari morbo*; Seren. Sann. 706 f. (using Horace too); Jerome's information on Ennius is a weird mixture of fact and various layers of fiction).

² Evidence in VAHLEN, pp. XIII-XV. Vahlen's stricture on Cicero's statement that Ennius *in Aetolia militauerat* ("*Cicero parum accurate scribit*") is strangely misconceived: Ennius was technically *miles* under his commander M. Nobilior, though he might have been described as *contubernalis*. Cicero does not mean to imply that he did any fighting.

³ Cic. *Brut.* 79. See below pp. 183 f.

⁴ MÜNZER, *Hermes* 40 (1905), 66 (accepted LEO, *Gesch.* I 156¹) pointed out that Cicero's statement that he died at the age of seventy may be based, ultimately, on the mere fact that his *Thyestes* (which Cicero dates in the year of his death, at the *ludi Apollinares*) was the last play of which there was a *didascalica* date. Jerome (*l.c.*) says *septuagenario maior* and may be following a more accurate tradition, which recognised the nature of the evidence.

⁵ Cic. *Arch.* 22: *in sepulcro Scipionum putatur is esse constitutus ex marmore*; Ovid, *a.a.* III 409 f.; SUERBAUM, pp. 210-3, with earlier literature.

⁶ Val. Max. VIII 14, 1, and later sources collected VAHLEN, p. xix (with the just comment: *Apparet non tenuiter crevuisse fiduciam rei narratae*).

himself given the order for this (presumably before his own death, hence many years before the poet's) because Ennius had celebrated him in the poem *Scipio*. That story, in the present company, is hardly worth refuting¹. But it is important in showing us, with welcome clarity, the way in which such legends grow and gain acceptance. We must apply the lesson elsewhere.

Cicero, in his *Cato de senectute*², presents Ennius as a *familiaris* of the elder Cato, in a context in which he tries hard to stress Cato's cultural interests (in his usual way of seeing his heroes, in the dialogues, through spectacles coloured by the rosy glow of his own ideal *humanitas*): Cato is made to cite poetry every few sections! Cato, in the same context, mentions and dates his own quaestorship and goes on to give high personal praise to Ennius. Yet there is no word of Cato's having brought Ennius to Rome. In the *prooemium* to the *Tusculan Disputations*³, Cicero gives a list of Roman poets and of cultured Roman aristocrats (Cato is included as *studiosus*); he mentions Fulvius' taking Ennius with him to Aetolia and Cato's consequent attack on Fulvius—yet once more there is no mention of Cato's having brought Ennius to Rome himself. In the *Brutus*⁴ Cicero cites Ennius for the consuls of 204 and mentions—quite irrelevantly, and uniquely in the dialogue, as far as contexts of this sort are concerned—the fact that Cato was quaestor in that year. Ennius is emphatically introduced as the source

¹ The facts, ever since Vahlen, have been generally recognised. But fiction still finds determined defenders, e.g. G. HAFNER, *Das Bildnis des Q. Ennius* (1968) 42 f.

² Cic. *Cato* 10 (quaestorship and consular date; reference to Q. Fabius: *de quo praeclare familiaris noster Ennius*).

³ Cic. *Tusc. disp.* I 3 f.

⁴ Cic. *Brut.* 57-60. Note 60: *at hic Cethegus consul cum P. Tuditano fuit bello Punico secundo, quaestorque his consulibus M. Cato... et id ipsum* [perhaps merely Cethegus' oratorical skill; but it could refer to the whole complex of facts] *nisiunius esset Enni testimonio cognitum, ...*

of information on the consuls ; but again there is no mention of Cato's bringing him to Rome in that very year. One argument from silence might be impugned : perhaps Cicero merely did not bother to tell the obvious story. But *three* such cases, each in a context where positive mention was very much to the point, add up to a strong argument. We may safely assert that Cato's reported action in bringing Ennius to Rome from Sardinia, which we in fact first find in Nepos¹, was either not yet known to Cicero, or deliberately rejected. It is, in fact, parallel to the tale of Ennius' statue, except that here, where he is not straining evidence to the limit in court, Cicero does not even mention the suspect story as a rumour ; it is most likely that he ignored it. It follows, we may add, that Ennius himself did not mention it in his poems, which Cicero knew well².

Of course, the story might still be based on good tradition ; but the onus of proving that it is surely belongs to those who would defend it. Particularly since it is not at all obvious what Cato, who was Scipio's quaestor in Sicily and Africa, was doing in Sardinia on his way back. Where the point has been discussed, it has usually been held that he must have been driven off course by storms (and then, it is implied, found Ennius in Sardinia, waiting—if one may put it that way—for a kind passer-by to give him a lift to Rome). I find it difficult to believe this, especially since the difference in course (reckoning from the Gulf of Tunis to the Gulf of Cagliari) is more than 90 degrees and the distance nearly 200 miles³.

¹ Nep. *Cato* 1, 4 ; hence (ultimately) Hieronym. *Chron. s.a.* 1777.

² SUERBAUM, p. 142, recognises mention of the incident by Ennius as doubtful. But he regards the story itself as *gesichert* (p. 308) and tries to connect it with the "vision at Portus Lunae" : Cato is supposed to have put Ennius ashore there. On this see below, p. 193, n. 3.

³ VAHLEN (p. x) notes several difficulties in the story (*non uno nomine obscura est*), but regards it as quite certain (*certum est*), on the strength of Nepos'

On the other hand, it is well known that Cato's quaestorship attracted other legends, to the point where the facts and even the date became obscured. Different sources put it in 205 (especially Plutarch) and 204 (especially Cicero), and with the date 205 goes the story that Cato left his province and went to Rome, to take part in the attack on his commander Scipio launched in that year in the Senate¹. It is now generally held that 204 is the true date and 205 due to the legend of the attack on Scipio; I concur with this judgment for the reasons usually given, to which I would add another point: Cicero, both in the *Cato* and in the *Brutus* passages that we have looked at, mentions the date in an Ennian context—in the *Brutus*, as we saw, putting it in quite irrelevantly with that of the consuls. I would suggest that the date of the quaestorship was in fact mentioned by Ennius under the consular date 204.

The facts of Cato's quaestorship were soon deformed by legend. In the case of the supposed connection with Ennius we can see legend developing. We have seen that in Nepos Cato brought Ennius back with him from Sardinia as quaestor. Now, Cato did in fact go to Sardinia, not (however) as quaestor, but as praetor in 198; and the *De uiris illustribus* (47, 1), which does not have the Nepos story about the quaestorship, instead tells us that Ennius taught Cato Greek during Cato's Sardinian praetorship!² Just like the

word (*mera fide Nepotis*). LEO (*Gesch.* I 155²) thinks Cato went to Sardinia on business. *What* business?

¹ MÜNZER, *Hermes* 40 (1905), 68 f. first thoroughly discussed the whole matter and came to the conclusion that 205 (and the attack on Scipio) was true, with the Ciceronian version deriving from a deliberate apologia by Atticus for what was, by Roman standards, a shocking violation of *pietas*. See BROUGHTON, *MRR* I 310⁴ for brief and sound discussion.

² The author (as Professor Suerbaum points out to me) does not make it clear whether Cato is supposed to have taken Ennius with him or found him there. In any case, the story is irreconcilable with the one in Nepos. The facts appear to be that Ennius returned from Sardinia in 204 (when Cato

tale of the statue of Ennius in the tomb of the Scipios, the story of Cato's connection with Ennius can be seen growing under our eyes, from a rumour unknown to (or unrecognised by) Cicero, to an accidental and brief connection in Nepos, then to a close and essential one in the later source. Although this accretion does not in itself disprove the truth of the story in its original version, it suffices (I think) to do so when added to the serious and all but conclusive considerations already advanced, which make it unlikely enough in any case.

It might be suggested that Nepos drew on Varro's *De poetis* and should therefore be believed. If this source could be established, it would certainly inspire more (though not absolute) confidence. But we must recall that Nepos is here writing on Cato and not on Ennius: indeed, the short *Life* that we have is a summary based on a major work on Cato¹ and undoubtedly comes from the sources Nepos there used. I.e., the story is based on what we might call a Cato source and not an Ennius source. It should be noted that Nepos, like Plutarch, has what we must (with most scholars) regard as the wrong date for Cato's quaestorship: he shares 205 with Plutarch, where (we recall) it is part of an elaborate fiction involving Cato in the attack on Scipio made in that year. In fact, an enigmatic remark seems to show that Nepos knew that story, though—at least in the short *Life*—he did not choose to tell it². Hence

was quaestor elsewhere), while Cato only got to Sardinia in 198 (as praetor): those wishing to report a meeting of the two in Sardinia had to accommodate one of these facts to the other. WARMINGTON (*Rem. of Old Latin* I, p. xviii) combines the accounts into one glorious stew, without noticing the contradiction.

¹ As Nepos himself tells us (*Cato, ad fin.*). That work was undertaken at Atticus' request.

² *cum quo* [*i. e.* Scipio] *non pro sortis necessitudine uixit*—he applies the remark to the whole of their later lives, but its insertion here suggests that their quarrel in 205 (as in Plutarch) was known to Nepos and recounted in the full *Life*.

Nepos had an annalistic source contaminated with legend. This does not help to confer respectability on the Ennius part of the story—the less so if I am right in my conjecture that Ennius himself gave 204 as the date of Cato's quaestorship.

Now, why should anyone make up such a legend? We must certainly ask this question; indeed Leo considers that the report bears "the stamp of authenticity"¹, since he could think of no reason why anyone should make it up at a time when neither Cato nor Ennius had yet attained special fame. Yet, given the undoubted fact that some annalists were totally unscrupulous in tendentious invention, there is no special reason for surprise that one of them—possibly the same one who made up the attack on Scipio, or else a successor expanding his work—should hit on this story. It makes a pleasant and obvious foil to the story of Cato's later attack on Fulvius for taking the poet with him to his province, if Cato himself had brought the same man from a province to Rome. This, in fact, was seen by Ennius' first editor, who used the report in precisely this way². It is perhaps the most obvious explanation for the blatant fiction, especially since we first find it in close connection with the tendentious misdating of the quaestorship.

But there might be a more elaborate background, which we can only suggest with due caution. It is known that the early history of Latin poetry was a much debated subject in the late Republic, with the facts neither clear nor always the principal consideration³. Livius Andronicus is last

¹ LEO, *Gesch.* I, 155². That useful mark, often appealed to by scholars, is (alas) usually discernible only to the author's inner eye. Leo did not consider the possibility that the legend (like that of Cato's attack on Scipio, which he knows) was made up later, when the men concerned were famous.

² COLONNA, p. xi. We must again ask why Cicero, in a similar context, should have overlooked this obvious point.

³ See SUERBAUM, p. 2² and App. I (pp. 297-9), for recent discussion.

firmly attested in 207, as the author of an expiatory hymn or hymns addressed to Jupiter and Juno¹. The honour of founding his *collegium* was granted to him after his sacred endeavours had borne fruit, hence a little later². This is the last we hear of him, and he must by then have been over seventy³. By 200 he was certainly dead⁴. If the date of his death was ever known, it has not reached us. But it is unlikely that it was: as in the case of other early poets, he was probably assumed to have died soon after his last public appearance, hence around 206. The case of Naevius is more complicated⁵. He is last heard of in 204, the year in which some of the ancients put his death. Varro objected, but had (it seems) no actual date to suggest, except that he thought 204 too early. It has often been suggested that the reason for Varro's objection, despite his ignorance of a precise alternative, was that he found the notice of Naevius' death in Utica and accepted it (as one no doubt should); and this implies that Naevius cannot have died before 202, while that city was enemy territory⁶, perhaps not before 201,

¹ Livy XXVII 37 (esp. 7 f., 13 f.).

² Presumably after the battle of the Metaurus and the triumph of his patron M. Livius (see *MRR* I, 294). This, incidentally, will be the time when (according to Ennius, *Ann.* 291) Juno at last came over to the Roman side—a poet's success in bringing this about would give a later poet a splendid theme.

³ LEO, *Gesch.* I, 58.

⁴ A poet unknown to us (P. Licinius Tegula) performed a sacred task that would have been his, had he been alive (Livy XXXI 12, 10).

⁵ It has recently been discussed by H. D. JOCELYN, *Antichthon* 3 (1969), 32-47. Cf. also SUERBAUM, pp. 299 f. (especially on the *ueteres commentarii*). Hence I can be brief.

⁶ It was still being unsuccessfully besieged by Scipio in 203 (Livy XXX 8-10), and it cannot have admitted any Roman or ally of Rome until after the battle of Zama in 202, unless he was a traitor or deserter (which we do not hear about Naevius). It is not clear from Livy (XXX 36) whether Scipio occupied it at that stage; in any case, the final truce followed almost at once. The argument from Utica is cautiously accepted by SUERBAUM (p. 300—with a less plausible alternative) and JOCELYN (p. 42).

when peace with Carthage was formally made. This indeed seems to me the only probable explanation of Varro's reported view¹. But the date given by the *ueteres commentarii* quoted by Cicero—whatever they were—must also have had a reason, presumably the obvious and usual one that no more work of his was on record after that date. Hence it is, in the light of Varro's objection, his exile that should be put in 204, or perhaps 205, if the *commentarii* allowed a year after his last known work. Either date would be historically plausible in the light of the career of Naevius' chief noble enemy, Q. Metellus². It might in any case be tempting for a scholar fashioning the history of these early poets in the light of more rationalisation than knowledge to make Cato conveniently bring in another poet, just when Livius had died and Naevius, the poet hostile to

¹ H. DAHLMANN, *Studien zu Varro, 'De poetis'* (1962), 56 f., believes Varro thought of a date much later than 201 for Naevius' death, since (he claims) Cicero (*Brut.* 60) gives Plautus' date of death as twenty years later and regards this as the reason for Varro's view on Naevius' death. I fear that this interpretation is based on a misunderstanding of *nam*. Cicero says that Varro *uitamque Naevi producit longius. nam Plautus... [184 B.C.] mortuus est*. The *nam* has nothing to do with giving the reason for the previous statement, but is used 'elliptically'. See LEWIS and SHORT, *s.v. nam*, B 3 and 4.

² Thus F. MARX, *Ber. d. kgl. sächs. Ges. d. Wiss.* 63 (1911), 72 f. (choosing 204). JOCELYN, *Antichthon* 3, p. 42, believes that the story of Naevius' exile should be wholly rejected, as its author "misjudges badly the social conditions of third-century Rome and the status of Naevius. The latter was no Marius or Cicero driven into exile by the legal machinations of opponents of higher birth". The point had already been made (unknown to Jocelyn) by LEO (p. 78⁵): "wie wenn es sich um die Verbannung eines Staatsmanns handelte". Though later ideas may have influenced the verbal formulation, this in no way invalidates the story of the exile. Being (probably) a *ciuis sine suffragio* (JOCELYN, p. 34), Naevius could be expelled without much formality, by mere edict. In 205 his enemy Q. Metellus was dictator and could easily have banished him. Since in that capacity Metellus held the elections, 204 saw friends of his in high office, e.g. the urban praetor M. Marcius Ralla (see SCULLARD, *Rom. Pol.* 77), who would readily have done him this favour. Marx (l.c.) believes he was a lower-class citizen and subject to trial by the *tresviri capitales*. Even this would be easy to manage. The story of the exile cannot be so cavalierly dismissed.

the Metelli and (in legend at least) to Scipio, had disappeared from the scene, whether by death or by exile. Point would be added by the fact that the poet introduced by Cato turned into a flatterer of Scipio and was later attacked by Cato himself. All this, however, though tempting, must remain speculation, and the obvious and straightforward explanation suggested above is sufficient.

Strictly speaking, we therefore perhaps cannot tell whether Ennius was ever in Sardinia or when he came to Rome. But here I would agree with Professor Suerbaum¹ that Silius will not have spun his own story about Ennius' military service in Sardinia out of whole cloth. When, in *Pun.* XII 390 f., he makes the poet serve as a Roman centurion, he merely exposes his own astonishing ignorance and failure to do the most elementary research on his subject². But why Sardinia, if not because there was a tradition ultimately based on Ennius himself—whether or not Silius had read him—to the effect that Ennius had served there, presumably as an auxiliary? Similarly, why Sardinia as the place from which Cato brought him, unless there was such a reference? As for the date, we have already seen reason to believe that the poet emphasised the year 204, with a eulogy of the consul M. Cethegus—long since dead, as the wording of lines 306 f. shows—and a mention of the quaestorship of M. Cato, to whom, as we know from *pro Archia* 22, Ennius gave special praise (no doubt as an example of *Romana uirtus*). If we want a factual basis for the story that Cato brought him to Rome (which would be pleasant, though not absolutely essential), it could most

¹ SUERBAUM, p. 46¹⁴⁶; p. 138⁴⁴⁰ (where, for 'Prätor' (l. 5), read "Quästor").

² In this he has been followed by some modern scholars, e.g. WARMINGTON, *Rem. of Old Latin* I, p. xviii, at least adding, "according to Silius"; and now KRENKEL, *Lucilius* (1970) I 13, without warning or doubt. JOCELYN (*The Tragedies of Ennius* (1967) 43) calls him "a soldier of fortune". In fact he can only have been a conscript (perhaps an officer) in an auxiliary unit from his area.

easily be found if we assume that Ennius mentioned his coming to Rome in the year in which Cato was quaestor. On all counts, therefore, we may (if we wish—there is nothing compelling in it) still believe that the information about Ennius' service (not as a centurion!) in Sardinia and the date of his arrival in Rome does go back to the poet himself: it is only the Cato story that must be discarded.

That, after his arrival, Ennius was a teacher¹ we may well believe: it was an obvious way of making a respectable living. There is no sign, for a long time, of attachment to one particular patron, and we shall see that Ennius did know several eminent Romans of the younger generation; though, of course, we need not conceive of him as a *grammaticus* running an actual school. Jerome adds that he lived on the Aventine, with only one maid to wait on him and in fact in poverty. The story of the one maid has often been doubted: it may be built on nothing more substantial than the Scipio Nasica anecdote told by Cicero, which we shall soon have to discuss. The "poverty", similarly, may come from Cicero's *Cato*, where Ennius is praised for having borne old age and *paupertas* like a man. It is in any case no more than a conventional *locus* in the biography of a poet. Both the "poverty" and the residence on the Aventine have recently been traced by Professor Skutsch to Porcius Licinus—about whom we know very little indeed, except that he was of noble family and that, in this particular account, he was making a highly polemical point regarding the ingratitude of rich patrons². At least as far as Ennius' residence

¹ Suet. *Gramm.* I 2.

² O. SKUTSCH, *Studia Enniana* (1968), 27². On Porcius Licinus (*RE*, s.v. Porcius, no. 48) much ignorant nonsense has been written. He was identified by Büttner with a slave freed by C. Gracchus' widow and called Licinius (see *RE*, s.v. Licinius, no. 5). A L. Porcius Licinus was *cos.* 184, and the poet must belong to the same family, since a freedman could not adopt the family *cognomen*. A L. Porcius Licinus, in or soon after 118 (M. H. CRAWFORD,

is concerned, however, I think the statement can perhaps be confirmed and slightly greater precision attained.

Professor Otto Skutsch has recently argued for positing a hitherto unknown gate in the Servian Wall, the *Porta Tutilina*¹; and he places Ennius' residence there. I am not entirely convinced; but I think that his discovery has opened the door to renewed investigation, and that his basic points are sound, even though I would arrange them to show a slightly different pattern.

First, it seems to me that, in the present state of our topographical knowledge, we cannot see any need for another gate on the Aventine. Gates naturally lead from major thoroughfares inside the city to major roads outside, just as their modern equivalents—traffic roundabouts or interchanges—do. In the area with which we are concerned², the *Porta Capena* is much the most important gate, leading from the *Circus Maximus* to the *Viae Appia* and *Latina* and serving the main city street that runs between *Palatine* and the *Caelian*; the *Porta Naevia*, of the location of which we can be only approximately certain³, connects that same street with the *Via Ardeatina*; while the *Portae Rauduscula* and *Lavernalis* drain the two main streets on the *Aventine* (as well as the street conventionally called 'della *Piscina Publica*') into the *Via Ostiensis*, one of Rome's

Roman Republican Coin Hoards, Table xi), minted some of the famous 'Narbo' *serrati* (SYDENHAM, *CRR*, no. 520). He may well be the poet.

¹ SKUTSCH, *BICS* 17 (1970), 121 f., for the first time properly analysing Varro, *LL* V 163.

² I.e. the *Caelian* and the *Aventine*: the *Porta Capena* lies in the depression between them. See A. P. FRUTAZ (ed.), *Le Pianta di Roma* II, tav. 118 (Lugli-Gismondi, 1949). H. KIEPERT, *Atlas Antiquus*, Tab. IX, though now in need of correction elsewhere, still seems to give a good idea of what is known of the topography of "Servian" Rome in this area. A. MERLIN, *L'Aventin dans l'Antiquité* (1906), 119 f., discusses the gates mentioned by Varro.

³ For discussion see MERLIN, *l.c.*, and cf. PLATNER-ASHBY, *Top. Dict.*, s.v. *Porta Naevia*.

major trade and traffic arteries. Between the Portae Capena and Naevia, where the new "Tutilina" must be postulated, no roads are known (nor indeed topographically particularly likely, in view of a ridge in the terrain), nor—as far as we know—would there be any city streets to drain off apart from those already amply served. The distance between the Capena and the probable site of the Naevia is only about 600 metres: perhaps five to ten minutes' walk. This, of course, is not decisive, since our information on "Servian" Rome is so poor; but it strongly suggests that no gate was needed here, and none should be assumed, especially if other explanations are possible.

At the same time, we know where—much later, at least—the goddess Tutilina was: according to Tertullian she was in the Circus Maximus, and the *loca Tutilinae* mentioned in connection with Ennius ought to be in that neighbourhood. Now, the Porta Capena, as we have seen, leads straight out of the Circus Maximus, in the dip between the Caelian and the Aventine. Surely that cannot be coincidence. Skutsch made the important discovery that Varro's reference to Tutilina here is inexplicable unless she had given her name to a gate in the Wall. This should be accepted and seems irrefutable. The obvious answer, in the light of all these facts, is that Varro, interested in antiquities as he always was, here mentioned an archaic name for the Porta Capena itself (which would be precisely in its right place here). We owe the discovery to Professor Skutsch's alertness.

As for the *loca Tutilinae*, we obviously cannot put them in any precise place; indeed, the word "loca" suggests that Tutilina may have featured in various scattered places over a certain area: a statue in the Circus, a gate a little east of it; perhaps even an altar on the Aventine side of the gate. It is instructive to compare those other ancient goddesses, the Camenae, attested in various places along the

Caelian¹; there is, in fact, a noticeable overlap in their respective territories. Tutilina may be another archaic deity, gradually—like the Camenae—displaced in historical times. In any case, nothing follows with any certainty about Ennius' habitation: unless we emend the first fragmentary word in our Varronian snippet from *-ligionem* to *regionem* (which, in a fragment of this nature, one has no justification for doing), Porcius may well here have spoken, as indeed Vahlen thought, of a cult specially honoured by Ennius. We shall see that this would tie in with the Camenae once more. However, if, on the strength of this, we want to posit that Ennius, when he first came to Rome, took up residence on the eastern slope of the Aventine, this cannot strictly be refuted.

We must remember that, when Ennius came to Rome, the Aventine was still the stepchild of the city—even though it had had one street ever since 240. There were as yet no drains, no public water, no secular public buildings². It was only between 200 and about 140 that proper urban development took place. In 193 the *porticus Aemilia* was built by the aediles L. Paullus and M. Lepidus; in 192 another portico was added; 184, under the censors M. Cato and L. Flaccus, saw the first drainage; and there was more work done under the censors of 179 and 174. The state and appearance of the Aventine towards the end of the third century can be gathered from the fact that, at the time of Hannibal's half-hearted attack on Rome in 211, a unit of 1200 Numidian cavalry deserters was stationed there³—unfortunately it is not clear precisely where; but the amount of vacant space needed for this purpose was clearly consider-

¹ See PLATNER-ASHBY, *s.v.* Camenae. On Tutilina, see SKUTSCH (*l.c.*) and WISSOWA, *RKR*², p. 202 (taking an excessively narrow view of her *loca*).

² On all this see MERLIN, *op. cit.*, pp. 246 f.

³ Livy XXVI 10, 5 f. (the details are not very clear).

able. It was therefore not a thickly populated part at the time of Ennius' arrival, and we must wonder why he settled just there.

The usual explanation¹, that it will have been because of the nearness of the guild centre of the poets in the temple of Minerva on the Aventine, is probably near the truth; though perhaps it does not dig deeply enough. The temple, at any rate, stood on the eastern part of the main (northern) peak of the Aventine. Where Ennius lived—at least later in life, if we believe that he lived near Tutilina country earlier on—can in fact be gathered with fair certainty. Cicero reports—and the report reads as if it were based on a statement by Ennius himself—that he was a neighbour (*vicinus*) of Ser. Sulpicius Galba². Now, we know where some of the estates—perhaps the main urban properties—of that family were: on the western slope of the Aventine, down to the Tiber and what is now Monte Testaccio. That is where we later find the *horrea Sulpicia* (or *horrea Galbae*), perhaps built by the consul of 108, who appears to be the Galba whose tomb was in that area³. If Ennius was the *vicinus* of these estates, he must have lived on the western slope of the Aventine, overlooking the Tiber—perhaps near the present S. Anselmo (a very pleasant location). There he would be only about 500 m from the temple of Minerva along the “*vicus Armilustri*”. It was clearly not a bad area, though, if he lived there from the start, it would at first be without public amenities. But people have at all times been prepared to sacrifice public amenities for a pleasant location. The area was certainly far from overcrowded and the *vicinitas*

¹ See VAHLEN, p. XI.

² Cic. *Ac.* II 51. VAHLEN (*l.c.*) admits bafflement as to any topographical implications.

³ See PLATNER-ASHBY, *s.v.* Horrea Galbae; the inscription: *ILLRP* 339. (Possibly the homonymous *cos.* 144.)

of the Galbae guarantees respectability: despite Porcius' emphasis on his *paupertas*, it would be a mistake to imagine him as living in the slums. At the same time, it was, of course, not one of the really fashionable quarters: the "Good Companion" passage, which we shall soon discuss in detail, shows that Ennius knew his station and was not likely to make the kind of social blunder characteristic, in their different ways, of a Cicero and a Trimalchio. The old connection of the Aventine with the Plebs and early Plebeian movements may be relevant, in a roundabout way. Not that we may see Ennius, hobnobbing with aristocrats and celebrating the aristocratic qualities in his poems, as a class-conscious champion of an oppressed Plebs! No, the real connection is probably to be found in the fact that the Aventine will have been the residence of the upper stratum of Plebeians: the merchants and prosperous artisans, who wanted to be near the Tiber and for whom the temple of Minerva provided a guild centre. These were not the proletarians of the Subura and the centre of the city, which must even at that period (and especially during the crisis of the Hannibalic War) have been overcrowded and unhealthy. These were the men who had provided leadership for the early Plebeian movements—or rather, those of them who had not (or not yet) joined the new aristocracy. It was there that Ennius would be precisely among men of his own station: we must remember that the poets, as artisans, also had their guild centre at the temple of Minerva. That temple thus has its relevance to Ennius' choice of a residence, though the relevance is a little more complicated than a first glance might reveal.

In due course, Ennius, of course, acquired several aristocratic connections and even friends. Some are better attested than others. Thus, as we have seen, Scipio and Cato are dubious, both enveloped by myth. Not, of course, that Ennius did not know and celebrate them. In the case

of Scipio that is guaranteed by the poem he wrote about him, in the case of Cato by Cicero's emphatic words in the *Pro Archia*¹. It is a pity that the lavish praise for Cato has not yet been attested in our fragments. Perhaps, indeed, an attempt can be made to do so. Cicero's context suggests chiefly military achievements; and we know that Ennius was in fact most interested in those. Cato's most distinguished success was his pacification of Spain in his consulship, after a major revolt caused by the Roman decision to annex the provinces occupied in the Hannibalic War²; and the first part of that war—a prolonged and difficult campaign, leading to what was perhaps the decisive victory—centred on Emporiae, where a friendly Greek settlement provided a base for action against a hostile Spanish settlement, which became a centre for resistance in the area³. Perhaps it is in this context that we should place the mysterious line that appears in Vahlen as the last of the *Annals* (628): *apud emporium in campo hostium pro moene*. Once we write the second word as a proper name⁴, its precise applicability to Cato's campaign stands out, and the difficulty of making sense of it in its traditional form vanishes. Of course, if it is to make a hexameter and find its place in the *Annals* (where, from the subject-matter, it belongs), we shall have to emend—not unusual in our text of Festus. One might suggest, purely *exempli gratia* (for we can never hope to

¹ VAHLEN, pp. 212-4; Cic. *Arch.* 22.

² See *MRR* I 339; *RE*, s.v. Porcius, coll. 112-5 (Emporiae 113-4); cf. my *Foreign Clientelae* (1958) 120 f.

³ Livy XXXIV 11-14 has a detailed account.

⁴ The Latin form *Emporiae* is generally considered to be due to the dual nature of the city (Greek and Spanish); see *RE*, s.v. But the place is not mentioned in any surviving Latin author before Livy. Whatever the Latin form 150 years before Livy, Ennius was in any case quite likely to transliterate the Greek, which is always Ἐμπόριον. (I should like to thank Professor Suerbaum for obtaining, and the editors of *TLL* for giving, information from the *TLL* files.)

reach the true original wording of any thoroughly corrupt fragmentary line !): *in campo apud Emporium pro moene | hostium*. Cato's *hiberna* were three miles from the hostile Spanish city, and after a major battle fought there the city surrendered¹.

However this may be, there is no evidence for a close personal attachment of Ennius to either Scipio or Cato, although both were imagined by later fiction. Two other aristocratic friends are better attested as such: the *uicinus* Ser. Galba, whom we have already met; and Nasica (not otherwise specified), who appears in an anecdote related by C. Caesar in the *De oratore* (II 276), which brings in the one maid, later perhaps to become a symbol of poverty. Both these stories merit acceptance. In the case of Galba there appears to be a direct reference to a statement by Ennius; while the Nasica story is to some extent guaranteed by Cicero's using it as he does: he had plenty of examples of wit and had no need for dubiously authentic ones, and we all know the immense care he devoted to authenticity in the setting of his dialogues. Of course, his judgment may have been at fault; but it is safe to assume that he found the story in a source that he thought he could trust (perhaps even once more Ennius himself, telling a joke at his own expense in the *Satires*).

¹ O. MUELLER thought the line a Saturnian (almost anything can be!), BAEHRENS (*cit.* Vahlen) vindicated it for Ennius, to whom our source (Festus) assigns it. STRZELECKI did not admit it to his edition of Naevius. As far as we can judge, the quotation (as here reconstructed) makes quite acceptable Ennian verse. (For this type of spondaic ending, cf. lines 204, 304, 624.) Elision in a word of the type *hostium* is rare: line 11 (*animam et*) is not parallel. We could, however, assume that the *i* became consonantal—a phenomenon known in Latin poetry down to Vergil (see M. LEUMANN, *Lat. Laut- und Formenlehre* (1963), 110). In Ennius, those who would retain the MS reading in 251 (*compellat Servilius sic*)—as Professor Skutsch would do—should have no objection to this. The assumption of a quotation overrunning a line is admittedly a difficulty in Festus, though it would be easy enough (e.g.) in Nonius. But the reference in subject-matter seems to me clear, and the exact form of the line is irrecoverable.

However : who were the two men? In each case a father and a son are possible : Galba may be a little-known praetor of 187 or his very eminent son, the consul of 144, known for unusual distinction in oratory and genocide¹ ; Nasica may be the consul of 191 or his son, consul in 162. In each case, the older man has generally been preferred by modern scholars²—probably mistakenly, I submit. Let us first stress that in each case either man is possible. For the older pair this need hardly be established. As for the younger, Ser. Galba was probably born in 191, P. Nasica *c.* 205³. The younger Nasica, therefore, could have associated with Ennius for quite a long time ; Galba, while a young man when Ennius died, could certainly have been taught by him. The real point for preferring the younger man is different in each case, and much stronger in that of Nasica. In the case of Galba, Cicero mentions his name merely as Ser. Galba, without any explanation. Now, to Cicero, Ser. Galba (in the context of that period) was always and inevitably the great orator : it is doubtful whether he even knew of the obscure father. There can thus be no doubt that Cicero intended a reference to that man. However, Cicero may, of course, have been wrong, especially if he had no more to go on than the name in Ennius. Even so, there is no positive reason to disbelieve him, especially in the light of the second case. For in that story, the actual content makes the reference to the younger man certain. It is strange that the distinguished scholars who know the “ Good Companion ” passage so

¹ *MRR* I 456 f.; *RE*, *s.v.* Sulpicius, no. 58.

² See, e.g., LEO, p. 160 ; F. SKUTSCH, *RE*, *s.v.* Ennius, col. 2591 (Galba only—following Cichorius); MARIOTTI, *Kl. Pauly* II, 270 f.

³ Galba presumably got his praetorship (151) *suo anno*, though his consulship was delayed by his appalling record in Spain. Nasica was aedile in 169, but his praetorship was delayed a year until 165 (presumably by his active part in the Macedonian War), and his consulship duly followed in 162. A date of birth in 206 or 205 may be assumed.

well have more often discussed its textual and literary intricacies than recognised its social significance : in the light of that passage, which was at least *supposed* to be a self-portrait, it is inconceivable that Ennius could have associated with a distinguished consular, a Patrician of almost his own age, on a footing of such easy familiarity bordering on rudeness. This was possible only in the case of a much younger man, where the moral authority of an older man and a teacher would make up for the vast difference in social status : the friendship of Polybius and the younger Scipio Africanus, of course, provides the chief example. It is clearly in terms such as these (though this relationship was perhaps not as priggishly philosophical, as the anecdote shows) that we must conceive of Ennius' relations with a Scipio Nasica—and, I suggest, also with a Sulpicius Galba : Cicero's instinct was surely right, whatever the nature of his actual evidence. Ennius knew his station, and took as much pride in knowing it as in his actual aristocratic connections.

This brings us to another great family connected with Ennius, the Servilii. They are an interesting lot, especially at this period. Rising from what one may call inconspicuous nobility to hold—through two brothers and a cousin—the chief power in Rome towards the end of the Hannibalic War, they then fade out—though probably both the power and its fading are exaggerated in our sources¹. That this is so in the latter case can be demonstrated : one of the brothers, C. Geminus, is both a pontifex and a *decemvir s.f.*—a very unusual cumulation of sacred offices at the highest level.

¹ Two brothers, C. and M. Geminus, and a remote cousin, Cn. Caepio, held high office in 203, Caepio and C. Geminus as consuls and M. Geminus as *magister equitum* to the dictator P. Galba appointed during that year. The dictator held the elections and M. Geminus was elected one of the consuls for 202. That year again saw a dictator, appointed by the consul M. Geminus—he named his brother C. Geminus. Throughout the year, one of these brothers was in Rome and the other had an army in Etruria. See SCULLARD, pp. 78 ff., and *RE*, *s.v.* Servilius, nos. 44, 60, 78 (also for what follows).

He became chief pontiff in 183 and, in the 180s (he died in 180), must have been a man of particular distinction and *auctoritas*. That he is rarely mentioned by Livy merely underlines what we have already had to note: that historian's lack of knowledge of, or interest in, the real working of the Roman 'Establishment'. The other brother, M. Geminus, lived much longer—indeed, he was still alive in 167, when Livy's narrative fades out for us, so that we do not know when he died. He—not unexpectedly—was an augur, complementing his brother's offices. His historic moment (for Livy, at least) came in 167, when, in a dramatic speech, he threw the full weight of his *auctoritas* as an elder statesman and distinguished soldier behind L. Aemilius Paullus and succeeded in fending off opposition to Paullus' triumph¹. It is against the background of the record of this family that we must see the 'Good Companion' piece (*Ann.* 234-51), to which we can now at last turn our attention.

Precisely what the *historia Servilii Gemini* was, no one has ever discovered. The word itself, especially in Gellius, means no more than "story"². Was it merely a piece of lengthy description, or a major excursus summarising a great man's life at a decisive moment? It is unfortunate that we know far too little about Ennius' technique to be able to answer this question. Its length, at any rate, must have been considerable: the portrait of the companion, which is all we have, alone takes up eighteen lines. Before it, there must have been a speech by Servilius, presumably after a battle (see below); then an address to the companion, with some kind of conversation; then a period of rest and a new battle scene. This is the bare minimum, even without any additional summary of Servilius' life. Although speeches

¹ Livy XLV 36-39. It would be pleasant to think that Ennius lived to hear that great speech in 167. Alas, we do not know (see above, p. 154, n. 4).

² See *TLL*, s.v. *historia*, col. 2839.

in Ennius need not have been long, and battle scenes seem to be mainly a collection of striking incidents, 100 lines seems the very least we must allow for the *historia*. It reinforces the judgment of many good scholars, that the *Annales* were far from being annalistic in any proper sense. We must imagine them as a series of episodes and comments rather than as any kind of 'history'. With all his great gifts, Ennius seems to have been no master of composition and structural planning¹.

We must now approach the thorny problem of the identity of the Geminus who is the hero of the passage. Opinions have varied widely². The one that may be said to hold the field now is that of Cichorius, as expressed in Norden's book. It is worth noting, as a matter of interest, that when he first treated the question³, Cichorius casually and without argument assumed that the numeral in Gellius was mistaken and thought that M. Geminus (*cos.* 202) was intended. But by 1915, when he came to write a long commentary (pp. 135-42) in Norden's book, he fully committed himself to the younger Publius and the battle of Cannae, as had been claimed by Hug. This, of course, also implied a change in the numeral in Gellius, and he explained it as

¹ LEO, p. 171. TH. BERGK, *Kritische Studien zu Ennius, Jahrbücher* 7 (1861), 322, put it very well: "Bedeutende Begebenheiten wurden teils ganz übergangen, teils mit summarischer Kürze abgetan, während der Dichter dann wieder geringfügigen Ereignissen die ausführlichste Darstellung widmete." He applies this mainly to the later books. But it is obviously true (e.g.) of the First Punic War, if we combine the poet's own statement with the facts of the fragments (see O. SKUTSCH, *Studia Enniana* 34-36, 128³).

² Some representative examples: VAHLEN was sure it referred to Publius (*cos.* 252 and 248), and LEO, *i.a.*, accepted this; HUG rejected it and thought it must refer to that man's son Gnaeus (*cos.* 217), who died heroically at Cannae (this involved changing the book number VII in Gell. XII 4, 1 to VIII—*audacius fortasse*, as Hug admitted); HEURGON, in his edition of the *Annals* (1958), does not decide between VII, VIII and IX, with a different identification in each case (p. 81).

³ CICHORIUS, *Unt. Luc.* (1908) 277, on Lucil. 221 M.

probably due not to an error in the manuscript, but to one by the author himself, who had got the passage from Varro, and had added a mistaken book number from a faulty memory.

This view, which may fairly be said to be the commonly held one, seems to me unlikely; and since the matter is important, it must be discussed. (Of course, as I have stressed before, no one can lay any claim to certainty or to arguments that are really decisive.) First, I do not think *inter pugnas* can mean 'between the individual engagements of a single battle'—or that, as others have claimed, it can mean *inter pugnandum*¹. In fact, it seems to me that it ought to mean what at first sight it does mean, namely, *inter pugnas*: between two battles. A battle has just been fought, and another is expected; the scene would be set either in the evening, after the end of the first, or the following morning, just before its resumption as the second. No one needs to be told that such a situation—a battle divided into two parts, i.e. two battles, by nightfall—is common enough throughout antiquity. I do not see why the phrase should be taken in anything other than its natural sense; and this entirely excludes the battle of Cannae. Secondly, I think it appears from the phrase *summ̄is rebus regundis* (237) that the man is more likely to be consul at the time; though,

¹ Professor Skutsch tells me that he also rejects Cichorius's explanation of the phrase as referring to incidents of the same battle, but defends the meaning *inter pugnandum*. Among the parallels he kindly let me see (phrases like *inter arma*, *inter proelia*), some are indecisive, possible only in the plural (*inter arma*); the others (type *inter proelia*) seem to me, when checked in the context, to mean at most "in the midst of battles" (etc.)—never "in the midst of fighting" (etc.) where only a single specific occasion is meant. Hence I do not find this meaning—essential for the Cannae interpretation—established. Skutsch's point on the stylistic contrast between the fighting mentioned at the end and the dining at the beginning of the passage (*Studia Enniana* 101¹⁷) is, of course, valid; but it does not help in deciding which occasion(s) of fighting is/are meant: this must still be disengaged from the phrase *inter pugnas* itself.

of course, a reference to a consulship in the previous year is not actually excluded. Finally, and most important: I do not think we have any right to change the book number in our text except for the gravest of reasons.

As far as I have been able to check, in the case of surviving works (such as Cicero, Lucretius, Vergil), Gellius' record for accuracy on Republican and Augustan Latin authors is absolutely perfect¹. Where this is so (and Gellius shares the distinction with Macrobius), and the instances on which one can check amount to many dozens and not merely an isolated few, there is, as a point of method, no legitimate reason for a change unless there is either serious division in the manuscripts or a totally compelling reason of interpretation.

I admit the temptation of making changes, where they seem convenient. I myself should very much like to put the Fabius Cunctator fragment in Book XVII: the change from XII to XVII² is easy, and the context there is admirable and obvious—the address of L. Paullus to restive soldiers in Liguria³. On the other hand, in Book XII no one has ever found a plausible context, except for Vahlen, whose elaborate theory making it plausible was chiefly invented *ad hoc* and is now generally and rightly rejected. Yet, having said all this, I must admit that I regard Macrobius'

¹ NORDEN (p. 66), trying to discredit Gellius' accuracy, found (in Books I-X I) only one error. (Contrast this with a mass of errors in the very first book of Nonius.) In I 2, 6 he cites Book I instead of Book II of Arrian's digest of Epictetus. But this was *contemporary* literature, much more readily cited carelessly than the "Classics". In I 22, 8 Gellius cites as from Book II of Cicero's *De republica* a passage that modern editors put in Book III (III 32). But this is simply another instance where an illicit change has been made: our text of that work is far too incomplete to justify the arrogant claim that Gellius must be wrong and we know better.

² Macr. VI 1, 23. A Salzburg MS cited by VAHLEN (p. 66) gives VII. But it is not cited by Willis, hence presumably not good evidence.

³ See CICHORIUS, *Unt. Luc.*, 275.

record for numerical accuracy as so perfect that the change is not justified, except perhaps with an expression of doubt (*audacius fortasse*), and in the apparatus. In fact, I would say that the rules of evidence here apply: the judge and even the jury may feel sure they know that the man is guilty, but they have no right to say so unless he is convicted by evidence that removes all reasonable doubt. Their intuition is simply not enough.

But this merely by way of illustration. Cichorius's suggestion that the fragment may come from Varro, quoted without book number, and with a mistaken one supplied by Gellius, seems to me quite inadequate. Gellius does take things over on trust—he certainly did the report that Ennius gave his age as 67 in whatever book it was. In that case, he neither checked nor (in fact) quoted. This among other facts probably justifies a change from the transmitted XII in that instance¹. But the man who caught Caesellius out in a defective quotation² was not likely to add, without checking, a mistaken book number from an imperfect memory—or at least, this ought not to be suggested unless the reasons for a change in this instance were far more overwhelming than they in fact are. It seems to me that, with the difficulties that still becloud identification with the battle of Cannae, there is anything but the kind of evidence going beyond all reasonable doubt which we need for justifying a change. A mere feeling that perhaps the balance of probability is in favour of Cannae—a feeling which I myself do not share—would be nowhere near enough, from the point of view of method, to justify a change such as would be necessary³.

¹ Gell. XVII 21, 43. See SUERBAUM, pp. 115 f. (bibliography pp. 117³⁸¹); 133 f.; 143 f. As far as I can see, it is the only book number in Gellius that S. is prepared to change. Cf. his splendid statement of principle p. 150⁴⁶⁹.

² Gellius VI 2, 3 (*Ann.* 381-3).

³ This, of course, is a principle that applies more widely, covering not only

This is perhaps the place to illustrate what harm can be done to our understanding of our author by illicit and irresponsible conjecture of this kind. Macrobius quotes two well-known lines on the indestructibility of Troy from Book X of the *Annals*¹:

*quae neque Dardaniis campis potuere perire,
nec cum capta capi nec cum combusta cremari.*

Vahlen reports the readings as *in undecimo*, and so they appear in the majority of MSS in Eyssenhardt's old edition of Macrobius. Willis reads X in two of three main manuscripts (the third, as often, omits the figure), with no basis whatever for XI². I cannot help wondering whether the idea first came from editors of Ennius who, like Vahlen, wanted to connect the lines with an imaginary great speech by Titus Flamininus to the Greeks at Corinth—a context for which no historical evidence exists and which Ennius is most unlikely to have made up, since the speech actually delivered was very famous. Nor would the physical indestructibility of Troy itself seem very relevant to that situation.

In fact, once we accept the transmitted book number X, a conjectural placing of the fragment becomes easy, and it secures a place in Ennius' work for a well-known incident. In 197, the people of Lampsacus decided to appeal to Rome, especially for help against Antiochus the Great, who was then subduing Asia Minor. In this they based themselves both on an old *συγγένεια* with the Romans, as living in the Troad, and on the help of Rome's old ally Massalia. The

the book written in Ennius' 67th year, but the uncomfortable Histrians in Book XV (Macr. VI 3, 3). But as we saw and shall see, these two cases provide instances where change appears legitimate. (Cf. p. 177, n. 1 and Appendix, pp. 198 f.)

¹ Macr. VI 1, 60 (lines 358-9).

² On the figure XI Willis notes: "*vulg., nescio unde.*"

text of a well-known document attests the embassy of Hegesias of Lampsacus¹. The first Roman whom the envoys met was Lucius Flamininus (the brother of Titus), whose answer to them clearly accepts the plea of *συγγένεια* and reassures them at length. It seems to me obviously in this context—probably from a flattering speech by the envoys of Lampsacus, perhaps from a propagandist speech by Lucius Flamininus or another Roman—that this fragment should be placed. Ennius used the incident—as indeed the Romans had done—as an occasion both for proclaiming the Trojan descent of Rome, which was of the greatest long-term cultural significance for Rome as it entered the Hellenistic world, and at the same time for stressing the existence of Roman “relatives” surviving in the Troad itself—which was, at the time of our document, of great immediate political advantage and which the Romans henceforth eagerly insisted on when it suited them². The return to the proper manuscript reading in our source thus secures for Ennius a mention of a well-known and not uninteresting incident concerning the political events of the exciting years of the Second Macedonian War.

¹ *SIG*³ 591. Note especially lines 17 f., 21 f. On that famous inscription see E. BICKERMANN, *Philologus* 487 (1932), 277-99.

² Roman *συγγένεια* with Troy and its descendants became politically important in the First Punic War, where Segesta and Rome found the myth mutually profitable (see my *For. Client.* 37⁷; 44³). A letter to King Seleucus in Greek, interceding on behalf of Ilium, was quoted by the Emperor Claudius (Suet. *Claud.* 25, 3). The date would be the reign of Seleucus II or III (between 246 and 223) and the letter was probably a later forgery (M. HOLLEAUX, *Rome, la Grèce...* (1921), 45-60; but see *For. Client.* 44³). If so, it fits into the tradition that invented (as is generally agreed) the *adscriptio* of Ilium in the Peace of Phoenice (see *For. Client.* 59). In fact, Rome had not, by then, as yet decided to stake a claim in the East. The opportunity presented by Lampsacus seems to have been the first (HOLLEAUX, *l.c.*), and was eagerly seized. By the time of the war with Antiochus, the connection with Ilium was stressed on every possible occasion (Livy XXXVII 9, 7; 37, 1 f.; XXXVIII 39, 10). Ennius had stressed a turning-point in Roman policy.

We must now return to our story in Gellius, about the unknown exploit of our Geminus. I think we ought to accept that he was the consul of 252 and 248. After all, that P. Servilius was re-elected (with his colleague C. Cotta) after four years in a major crisis in the First Punic War: it was just after the disaster of P. Claudius, who had offended the gods by ignoring the sacred chickens¹. These, let us add, were the first consuls to be re-elected as a pair since 272, in another year of crisis, and the *last* pair in the history of the Roman Republic to achieve this distinction. That we do not know in what way they deserved this surely shows our lamentable ignorance of the period, rather than anything about the men themselves. Admittedly, the panegyrist can pick out for lavish and detailed praise what is not of really major significance in history; and we may admit that the exploits of Servilius and Cotta cannot have been of really major significance in the longer term, if they escaped the attention of Polybius. But the fact that the Romans bestowed this signal honour on Servilius and his colleague at a time of major crisis shows us that we do not know enough of the period of history concerned (any more than we do of the structure of the *Annals*) to make a change in our manuscript reading here, arrogantly transferring the whole incident to a person whom it will (to say the least) not very easily fit.

It may be added that the very fact that the exploits of the consuls of 252 had not been properly recorded by Fabius Pictor, the authoritative historian of that War, as is proved by Polybius, may have led his grandsons to ask our poet to accord him special treatment. After all, we have good reason to think that Ennius, in treating the War, concentrated precisely on what had not been properly done before. It does show, however, that Ennius stood close to the family of the Servilii, to oblige them in that way; the more so since

¹ See *MRR* I, 212, 214, 215 for the sources.

the fact that he took the opportunity of putting in a sketch of his own character—idealized and, as Professor Skutsch has pointed out, modelled on a known Hellenistic *genre*—and disarmingly proclaimed his own view of his social status confirms it. We have the word of Lucius Aelius Stilo for it, and I am glad to see that nowadays he is generally believed.

We know little about Stilo, except that he overcame the handicap of obviously low birth, through pure literary and scholarly merit. His name shows his origin: L. Aelius the Writer (Stilo), son of the Town-crier (Praeconinus), he was the son of a *praeco* from Lanuvium—by no means a member of the municipal aristocracy of that town, several of whom we know from coins and in other ways. It is, I suggest, quite likely that he was of freedman birth. Cicero tells of a Q. Mutto, *homo sordidissimus*, who was prosecuted by a L. Aelius, *libertinus homo litteratus ac facetus*. Cichorius thought this man might be a freedman of the erudite scholar¹. It is possible. But another possibility exists: he might be Stilo's father! A *praeco* was very low in the social scale—next to an undertaker and close to a pimp—and might well be a freedman. But wit was his stock in trade, and he might have a kind of clown's licence. Compare the Campanian Q. Granius². L. Stilo's rise to equestrian status was perhaps an even greater achievement than appears on the surface.

¹ The Mutto of Cic. *Scaur.* 23 may be identical with the man in Lucilius 1031 M, as urged by CICHORIUS (*Unt. Luc.*, 206 f.).

² *RE*, s.v. Granius, no. 8. Though there is no evidence of freedman birth for this man, a metrical tombstone of an A. Granius M. l. Stabilio Praeco survives (*ILS* 1932; *RE*, l.c., no. 10). Bücheler tried (wrongly) to identify him with Q. Granius (see *RE*, l.c.), but it is obvious that there was a relationship. Caesar's municipal law excluded *praecones* from municipal senates (Cic. *Ad fam.* VI 18, 1). See the *tabula Heracleensis* (*FIRA* 13), lines 94, 104 (and cf. 108-25 for other exclusions).

If he came from a client family of the aristocratic Aelii, he certainly had access to excellent information on the subject concerning us. A P. Aelius Paetus was *magister equitum* to the dictator C. Servilius in 202, and was made consul for 201 under his presidency. The Aelii Paeti have been called a family of "particular eminence" in the decade 203-194, specially distinguished as jurists¹. Of course, other families of aristocratic Aelii were also eminent. Stilo, in fact, moved in the highest circles, and must in any case have been able to gather much authentic information on Ennius. A statement he apparently made without hesitation or qualification should certainly be accepted. Moreover, support comes from the fact that the 'good companion' of Servilius apparently had no name. Of course, it is technically possible (as Professor Skutsch says) that the name was mentioned in the actual speech that follows our quoted fragment. But I think it unlikely: for would not Stilo (or Varro, or Gellius) have then more naturally said that 'under the name of' So-and-So Ennius painted a portrait of himself? In fact Stilo put it quite anonymously. He merely said that the passage as quoted was a self-portrait of Ennius. This looks like a pointer to real anonymity in the passage, and this means that the person thus introduced was probably fictitious, and his introduction can only be explained as a cloak for the idealized self-portrait.

It should perhaps be mentioned that one or two younger Servilii Gemini are known to have lived at this time, though their precise relationship to the eminent pair of brothers is unknown. It can safely be assumed, however, that they also stood in some sort of relationship with Ennius, as young Galba and others did². We have seen that the scholar,

¹ T. A. DOREY, *Klio* 39 (1961), 192.

² A. C. Servilius C.f. issued coins, probably in 58 B. C. (M. H. CRAWFORD, *Rom. Rep. Coin Hoards*, Table xiii), with Flora and the legend FLORAL

whether foreigner or merely of low citizen birth, must remain on a footing of inferiority and clientship with his own generation of aristocrats, but can become a personal friend of a younger generation whom he trains and advises.

And so to M. Fulvius Nobilior, Ennius' chief and most important patron. Clearly, Ennius was an established poet and teacher when he was asked to accompany Fulvius to Aetolia. As a reward for his poetic services to this man, we are told by Cicero (*Brutus* 80), Ennius was given the Roman citizenship by his son Quintus in 184. The son is quite explicitly identified by Cicero, as the consul of 153 and as interested in literature—though this is perhaps a mere deduction from his supposed service to Ennius. Now, this identification, as it stands, is totally unacceptable. In fact, we almost certainly know the career both of young Quintus and of his elder brother Marcus, and it emerges that Quintus must be six years younger than his brother. Their aedileships and praetorships as well as their consulships seem to be separated by exactly that interval¹. This means that he

PRIMVS on the obverse (*CRR* 890). Since this cannot refer to the first institution of the games (by two Publicii about 240: see *MRR* I, 219, 220³), it is usually taken as referring to their conversion into an annual event in 173—presumably (in view of the moneyer) by a Servilius as aedile. A M. Servilius (the *praenomen* makes him a Geminus, son of one of the famous brothers) was military tribune under L. Aemilius Paullus in Liguria in 181 (*MRR* I 385—add in Index). He may, but need not, be the unknown aedile. The Ligurian campaign—by what may, but need not, be coincidence—was singled out for attention by Ennius in Book XVII (see CICHORIUS, *Unt. Luc.* 277). There are multiple interrelationships here, which can only be glimpsed. The Floralia, instituted at the behest of the Sibylline Books, were certainly fashioned after Greek models. In due course they developed into licentious performances (see Val. Max. II 10, 8; Sen. *Ep.* 97, 8), of which Ennius would perhaps not have approved. But we do not know how or when this came about.

¹ See *MRR* I, 437 (Aediles) and 445 (Consuls) for Marcus, *ibid.* 445 (Aediles) and 452 (Consuls) for Quintus. Though there is some doubt about the aedile of 160 in isolation (*MRR* I, 445¹), the picture fits together—and also fits the *epulo* of 180 (see text)—so well that doubt seems unreasonable.

would indeed, as the date of his consulship suggests, be born around 196; and this would make him twelve years old in 184, when he is supposed to have given the citizenship to Ennius!¹ But there is more. A Q. Fulvius M.f. was made an *epulo* in 180 while still a boy (*praetextatus*)—an extraordinary event on which Livy (and presumably his source) comments². Clearly, to attain that office, he cannot have been *much* below coming of age. That means that we may put the date of birth of that young priest precisely around 196, which makes him almost certainly the son of M. Nobilior, the consul of 189 and Ennius' patron. Cicero was simply mistaken. He was not well informed on details of family relationships long before his own time; compare his ignorance of the early career even of P. Sempronius Tuditanus, consul as recently as 129, on whom Atticus had to put him right³. An error about the early career of a much less distinguished consul of a generation earlier need not surprise us. Modern scholars have found the proliferation of Fulvii at this precise period enough of a puzzle, and there is good evidence to show us that the ancients also did⁴. Even Atticus may have slipped up in this case.

If, as seems quite certain, the man who gave Ennius his citizenship in 184 was not Quintus, the son of the consul

¹ The identification is doubted in WEISSENBORN-MÜLLER on Livy XXXIX 44, 10; XL 42, 7; but there is confusion with Q. Flaccus, aedile 184.

² Livy XL 42, 7. The age for assuming the *toga virilis* varied, but 17 was common and was the official minimum age for military service.

³ See my discussion of this in *Homm. M. Renard* (1969), 54-65.

⁴ Livy XL 41, 8 produces a *frater* of Q. Fulvius Flaccus (*cos.* 180) who is called M. Fulvius Nobilior—a notorious crux (see *MRR* I, 391³). The Terentian *didascaliae* for the *Andria* and the *Hecyra* fail to give the *cognomina* of two Fulvii—almost the only such cases. (Of course, no *cognomen* could stand on an official record at that time and for many years after.) There were no fewer than five Fulvii about at the time (see *RE*, nos. 57, 60, 61, 93, possibly 44, and stemma coll. 231-2) who might have been on such a commission, though to us not all are equally plausible.

of 189, it becomes quite uncertain who he in fact was : most probably the annalistic tradition was simply mistaken in his *cognomen*, or Livy misunderstood what he found in his source. M. Nobilior (*tr. pl.* 171, *cos.* 159, therefore born about 202) could be *tresuir* for founding a colony at the age of eighteen in 184 ; in fact, Livy or his source may even have meant this ¹. But Livy's wording may suggest that he did not know which *cognomen* belonged to which man ; and originally, of course, no *cognomen* would appear in the contemporary record. So it may be that Cicero's statement is based on no more than misinterpretation of an annalistic notice just like the one that we have in Livy. On the other hand, it may well be that we simply have another instance of legend concerning Ennius, in this case spinning a *cognomen* out of the poet's known association with M. Nobilior. There may well be nothing in it at all. However, though uncertainty must remain, it is unfortunately certain that Cicero's statement must be rejected. It may serve as a demonstration, together with the contemporary story of Cato and Ennius, of how little was really known by the first century B.C., even where much was asserted.

M. Fulvius Nobilior leads to another man, not so often named in this connection : A. Manlius Vulso, *cos.* 178, the younger brother of Cn. Manlius Vulso, *cos.* 189 (the colleague of M. Fulvius Nobilior and the man sent to supersede the Scipios in Asia and make the treaty with Antiochus). Gnaeus had been elected in a peculiar way²: at first Nobilior alone secured the necessary majority ; then Nobilior held a new election, at which Vulso was made his colleague—clearly not without his cooperation. Now, this man's brother Aulus, obviously closely connected with Ennius' patron M. Nobilior, was the consul of 178 who fought the war in

¹ Livy's text reads " M. et Q. Fulvii, Flaccus et Nobilior ".

² Livy XXXVII 47, 6 f.

Histria that made Ennius take up his pen again and write Book XVI of the *Annals*. Pliny, of course, says he did so to celebrate the achievements of the two brothers 'Caecilii' Teucrici, and we must assume that this is what Ennius himself stated. The names and identities of these two young men provide a well-known crux which must be separately discussed, since we have now come to them; but that is best left to an Appendix. What I want to say here is that perhaps Ennius did not tell the whole truth in his own Preface, for personal and political reasons. It is difficult to believe that he resumed writing a work that he thought he had completed, simply in order to celebrate the (to us) impenetrable achievements of two young men whose identity is not certain and who (and this *is* certain) are not heard of again. We have seen that the consul involved in the war in Histria was a brother of a special friend of Ennius' patron M. Nobilior—and we must now note that this consul Aulus got into serious trouble over that war, which he had started without proper authority and which he very nearly lost. Livy shows how he was attacked by two tribunes and finally handed over his troops to his successor, the consul of 177, only after serious insubordination¹. In view of Ennius' personal connections, it is clear which side he would be on. I think this gives a much more serious and satisfactory reason for his continuing the *Annals*: the desire to exculpate and assist A. Manlius Vulso, no doubt at the request of his friend M. Fulvius Nobilior. As it happens, Nobilior held the supreme dignity of the censorship in that very year, and it is known that Ennius congratulated him and his colleague M. Lepidus on their public reconciliation in that office. Ennius was clearly still on very close terms with his patron. If all this is correct, it naturally reinforces the reasons often advanced for thinking that Book XVI must have been topical, i.e.

¹ Livy XLI 7, 4 f.; 10 f.

started in 178 or 177, and not many years later—which has an obvious bearing on Ennius' statement of his own age as being sixty-seven, supposedly in Book XII¹. But this needs no further development here.

It is to this war, incidentally, and to the exploits of the two brothers, that I would assign *Ann.* 367-9, unhesitatingly changing XII to XVII in Priscian (twice) and ascribing the error, as so often, to that author himself and not to a copyist. The striking story is told at length in Book XLI of Livy, and there is no parallel for it, with its elaboration, in the rest of his extant work. In the circumstances, the reference seems almost certain².

This is far from exhausting the importance of M. Fulvius Nobilior's connection with Ennius. For we must now say a few final words on the Temple of Hercules of the Muses, which was the most important result of this connection. I am not alone in thinking it very probable—though I cannot prove it, any more than others who have thought so could—that the discovery of this divine deced helped to inspire Ennius to transfer the Muses to Rome in song, as his patron had transferred them physically. Nothing, indeed, forces us to assume that the *Annals* were started before 187—in fact, Vahlen quite independently of this came to prefer a

¹ See p. 177, n. 1 and p. 178, n. 3. It should be obvious that, if there is anything in the suggestion here advanced (which seems to offer the only satisfactory reason for Ennius' resumption of his epic that I have seen), it deals the death-blow to any attempt to retain Book XII for the statement. That XVI-XVIII were known to Verrius in a separate publication was shown by O. SKUTSCH, *Stud. Enn.*, 20, with notes 3 and 4. Nobilior and Lepidus: *MRR* I 392; Ennius, *Ann.* XVII, fr. X. (But the book number is merely Vahlen's guess.)

² See Livy XLI 2-4: the Roman camp is lost, but recaptured after the enemy soldiers fall into a drunken sleep. COLONNA (pp. 111 f.) at once saw that this was the reference; though he did not yet know enough about the probable structure of the work to worry about the book number. He also (rightly) explains the fragment as referring to criminal negligence in those concerned. But his comment seems to have been lost from view by recent scholars.

later date. The *Scipio* would be quite enough to give M. Nobilior an assurance of glory, if he persuaded Ennius to celebrate him. Nor is there any sign that Ennius had had any converse with the Muses before¹. Whether or not he visited Delphi while he was in Greece is not very important; though he had plenty of time to do so and it would be strange if he missed his chance. In any case we know that the divine deced was discovered in Ambracia. The discovery must have seemed nothing short of an omen to M. Nobilior and his poet. The Muses, of course, were the patron goddesses (*i.a.*) of Greek poetry, and poetry had been much in the general's mind when he took Ennius with him. But Hercules was the god of victory and of success, the god to whom men dedicated a tithe after achieving their aims². Under the name of Hercules Victor (or Invictus), he had long had a round temple in the Forum Boarium near the Ara Maxima, where he received sacrifice. Thus victory and song were happily combined, and it was no wonder that the divine deced was transferred to Rome and given a special habitation in the Campus³.

The details of this complex are not in all respects clear, but the outline of its shape is known from the Severan Marble Plan of Rome. It is clear that Hercules must have stood in one of the round buildings marked within the enclosure: this shows a connection with the old home of Hercules Victor. How the Muses were arranged, we cannot tell; though, as it happens, we know precisely what they

¹ There is no reference to them in any fragment from his other works (as against 5 in the *Annals*). As O. SKURSCH has pointed out (*Stud. Enn.*, 18), the word is not found in Latin before Ennius. We shall see that the Muses still needed to be explained to a Roman audience.

² See Wissowa, *RKR*², 277 f.

³ For the temple (of "Hercules of the Muses", not "Hercules *and* the Muses", as might be thought possible but for the evidence of the coin *CRR* 810), see the outline on the Severan Marble Plan of Rome (best in E. NASH, *Pictorial*

(as well as Hercules) all looked like¹. It might be a little hazardous, but one ought to conjecture that there was one in each of the eight niches that we see in the inner enclosure, with the ninth at the back of that enclosure, where the picture on the plan is unfortunately not clear. In any case, it was on the walls of the enclosure that M. Nobilior must have put up his annotated copy of the *Fasti*, the product of much learning and research, fittingly under the protection of the Muses. In fact, it has recently been rightly pointed out that the whole structure was a *Mouseion*. Later it was known as the centre of the *collegium poetarum*, which met there (it seems) for recitations. It was there, too, that Accius dedicated his over-lifesize statue. Clearly, this function of the structure was no accident—it must have been the immediate purpose of the founder. His *Mouseion* could not but become the centre of the poets' guild. Of that guild, we know very little. We have references to occasional meetings and poetic competitions, but not before the late Republic. It was there, one may conjecture, that the critic Tarpa officiated².

Dictionary of Ancient Rome I (1961), 471). The best reconstruction, which (on the whole) I follow, is by B. TAMM, *Opuscula Romana* III (1961), 157 (see also H. CANKIK, *MDAIR* 76 (1969), 323 f., not adding much). She collects the evidence on the name of the temple and on the *collegium poetarum*. On Hercules Victor (or Invictus) see PLATNER-ASHBY, *s.v.* Hercules Victor.

¹ See SYDENHAM *CRR*, pp. 134-6 (with Plate 23). Hercules is shown playing the lyre (no. 810). Since Ambracia had been Pyrrhus' capital, the notice (Pliny, *NH* XXXVII 5) that Pyrrhus had a gem that (supposedly in its natural markings!) showed Apollo, playing the lyre, with the nine Muses, needs reappraising: it must be suggested that somewhere along the line of (apparently not scrupulously truthful) tradition the more usual Apollo was substituted for the most uncommon Heracles as *Musagetes*. This links the divine decad with Pyrrhus and, to the poet who recorded the Pyrrhic War in such splendid verse, would add further point to his vision of the Muses as the patron deities of his epic. Ennius' admiration for Pyrrhus, usually (and in part rightly) put down to his native environment in Magna Graecia, may at least in part stem from what he saw (and no doubt heard) at Ambracia.

² For the guild and its meetings, see TAMM, *op. cit.*, 166 f. On Tarpa, see *RE*, *s.v.* Maecius, no. 24. For the *Fasti*, clearly a lengthy work

It was undoubtedly a major (though still limited) step in the progress of poetry in Rome. Later, around 100, we find the Patrician senator C. Julius Caesar Strabo attending meetings of the guild—and Accius refusing to get up when he came in!¹ The incident shows that Caesar was not properly a member of the guild, on the same footing as Accius. But both he and other dilettanti nobles and senators—men like Porcius Licinus or Q. Catulus—will have been *patroni* of the college: all *collegia* had eminent patrons of this sort, as masses of inscriptions show. It was no doubt in that capacity that they attended: hence an obligation to get up when they came in. An inscription recently published and discussed shows a professional civil servant of freedman status as president of the guild of poets about the end of the Republic or early in the age of Augustus: apparently the actors were no longer in it, and this change—eliminating men of very low status—may well go back to the rise in prestige of the guild, consequent on the move from the temple of Minerva, which they shared with other tradesmen, to the protection of the Muses. However, the inscription also reveals the continuing low social status of the actual members of the *collegium*: we must conclude that no senator could be an ordinary member of it². Let me add, without

of scholarship (perhaps underrated in our tradition), see the intriguing speculations of P. BOYANCÉ, *RPh* 29 (1955) 172 f., linking these *Fasti* with the so-called books of Numa and with Pythagorean 'astral mysticism'. Though this is all highly speculative, I accept the contention that these *Fasti* contained an extensive calendar commentary; but I regard them as an inscription, since the idea of a book as an *anathema* (BOYANCÉ, p. 174) is rather far-fetched. The date of the building of the temple (which is not mentioned by Livy) remains a mystery. See also E. G. SIHLER, *AJP* 26 (1905), 1 f., especially 19 f.

¹ Valerius Maximus III 7, 11 (note *numquam*—not merely one meeting).

² E. J. JORY, *BICS* XV (1968), 125 f. The man is a Cornelius P. I. Surus, *nomenclator, praeco ab aulario ex III decuriis, accensus cos. et cens.* (whatever this last phrase means: *accensus* was not a regular professional status, but a personal appointment, and the phrase is added at the end of the inscription; probably

any evidence (I admit), that I believe that M. Fulvius Nobilior was chosen the first patron of the reconstituted college. It would be a fitting, and indeed an inevitable, gesture.

One further aspect of this deserves investigation. We know that, when Greek literature was first translated into Latin, the Camenae took the place of the Greek Muses and became the patron goddesses of letters :

uirum mihi, Camena, insece uersutum.

Ennius, as is known, put his epic clearly under the protection of the Olympian Muses. It is almost invariably asserted (sometimes in quite extreme tones) that he would have nothing to do with the older goddesses : he was the first who had scaled (?) the rocks of the Muses. One can even go on to deny that the corrupt and (admittedly) anonymous line from Varro that appears in Vahlen as *Ann.* 2 is Ennian¹, though this is uncommon nowadays. However, it is well known, and must not be forgotten, that when Ennius' patron built his temple of Hercules of the Muses, Numa's old *aedicula* of the Camenae, which had had no proper home since it was struck by lightning some time after 205, was deposited there, and the temple is in fact

Surus served as *accensus* to one man—his patron?—as consul and censor). He is *mag. scr. poetar.*, thus giving us the fact that the guild preserved its ancient name (see Festus 446 L f.), but had lost the actors. I would suggest that this may have been part of the social upgrading connected with the move to the temple of the Muses : actors were generally regarded as particularly disreputable. The date of the inscription is late Republican or early Augustan.

¹ I read *Ann.* 2 *Musas quas memorant nosce(s?) nos esse Camenas*. Ennian authorship denied by LEO, p. 184⁵. O. SKUTSCH, rightly stressing the connection between Fulvius' building of the temple and Ennius' invocation of the Muses (*Stud. Enn.*, 18 f.), seems here to imply no antipathy to the Camenae (cf. also 3 f.), though stressing the ways in which their associations differed from those of the Muses. Yet *ibid.*, 21 he speaks (without discussion) of Ennius' "contempt for the Camenae". See further p. 192, n. 2.

sometimes referred to as *aedes Camenarum*¹. It is to be gathered that the *aedicula* was quite prominently displayed within the new complex. It is clearly one of the two round structures featured in the plan—the other, as we have seen, must be the home of Hercules. In any case, the Camenae were not deities to be lightly dismissed or offended. They were connected with the most sacred mysteries of Roman religion: the *ancilia*, and the spring where the Vestal Virgins drew their holy water². We have also observed that they may well be connected with our old friend, the goddess Tutilina. In fact, we have seen that the area of the Porta Capena, in the middle of the country of the Camenae, must at one time have been called after Tutilina. The *aedicula* of the Camenae had been just outside that gate when it was struck by lightning, and had found a refuge in the temple of Honos and Virtus simply because it was the nearest available temple, only a few yards away. Tutilina, however, was of deep religious significance to Ennius among others.

The Camenae have perhaps been undeservedly neglected or played down by students of Ennius, who then have difficulty in accounting for the second line of the *Annals*, not to mention the special attention to the Camenae attested in the case of Ennius' patron M. Fulvius Nobilior. The action of M. Nobilior guarantees the Ennian authorship of

¹ TAMM, *op. cit.*, gives the evidence (see also SIHLER's old, but useful, study *AJP* 26 (1905), 1 f.).

² See (conveniently) *RE*, *s.v.* Camenae, col. 1427. The importance of the Camenae is duly appreciated by J. H. WASZINK, *C. et M.* 16 (1957). 139 f.; cf. *Mnemosyne* IV 3 (1950) 228 f. SUERBAUM, pp. 347 f., in a careful discussion of *Ann.* 2, rightly rejects Waszink's apparent translation of the line. I do not see, however, how Suerbaum arrives at the conclusion (p. 349) that—on the reading recommended by Skutsch and (except for the precise form of the verb) to be regarded as certain—it cannot be the Muses who are speaking: it must be the Camenae. It is clearly the Muses, explaining that they *are* the Camenae. This suffices to show that Ennius can have felt no contempt for the Camenae—quite the contrary.

the line and explains it. Ennius never meant to attack or belittle the Camenae, only to elevate them to higher standing by giving them their Greek name, with all the overtones that that name had acquired. Professor Skutsch rightly saw¹ that the line is taken from a personal (dream) appearance by the Camenae to Ennius. *Where* this was placed is anyone's guess. Those who believe (as I do, with perhaps the majority of scholars)² that Ennius met the Muses near the beginning of Book I will certainly wish to put it just there, with Vahlen. The Muses introduce themselves to Ennius (and his audience), explaining who they are—we recall that the word had not been used in Latin before, though students of Greek no doubt knew them. They explain that they are identical with those familiar and very sacred Roman figures, the Camenae. No doubt they reveal some further mysteries, perhaps explaining their connection with Olympus, with Helicon and/or Parnassus, the "rocks of the Muses"³. In other words, I expect they said something like this: "We,

¹ O. SKUTSCH, *Stud. Enn.*, 18 f., on *Ann.* 2.

² Certainly including Suerbaum and Waszink (for the latter's most recent opinion, see *Maia* 16 (1964), 327 f.).

³ I cannot pretend to certainty on whether Ennius, in his dream, 'visited' any or all of these mountains: at least, Persius' allusion in *Sat.* VI does not enable us to decide this. Nor can we be at all confident about the structure of the prologue as a whole. I should add that I have ignored the 'vision at Portus Lunae' (a myth based on *Ann.* 16), after SKUTSCH'S demonstration (*Stud. Enn.*, 25 f., following Housman) that the line probably does not come from the *Annals*. The fact that there is a lemma mark between *cor iubet hoc Enni* and the scholion on *postquam destertuit* (*Pers. Sat.* VI 10) vitiates most of the older arguments; and SUERBAUM'S reference (see pp. 51 f.) to the scholion on VI 1 (which does assert the provenance of the line from the *Annals*) is rightly rejected by SKUTSCH (*op. cit.*, 29¹²) with the argument that this scholion is late and based on nothing but interpretation of the text. As Professor W. Clausen has confirmed to me, the lemma marks can be trusted and go back to the oldest and best tradition; against them, the text of a scholion giving nothing that goes beyond a deduction—in fact mistaken—from the text cannot stand. *Portus Lunae* was probably mentioned in the *Satires*, in a jocular and mock-heroic way.

whom the Greeks call Muses, are really the Camenae, whom you have known all along and revered as most sacred in Rome. In Rome, we have looked after poetry of late. But if you want to be a genuine poet, you must now come with us to scale our mountain haunts in Greece." Precisely how this ties in with his vision of Homer, no one can tell; but if one may guess, I suspect that they may have introduced Ennius to his vision of Homer after taking him with them. In any case, Ennius went with them, and with the physical transfer the use of the Latin name becomes inappropriate.

Nobilior's action in transferring Numa's sacred and mysterious *aedicula* of the Camenae to the new complex of his *Mouseion* is not a contradiction of Ennius' attitude. We should not conceive (as many do) of the poet as suddenly having to fall in with his patron by publishing a recantation—or, according to Leo and others, not even going that far, but maintaining a stubborn silence and contempt for the goddesses whom his patron was conspicuously honouring. And the whole story becomes absurd if, as most scholars at the same time rightly believe, Ennius only began the composition of the *Annals* after his return from Greece, at the very time when his patron was commissioning the new temple! In any case, Ennius may well have specially honoured the Camenae himself, if our notions on Tutilina are at all on the right track.

The poet's attitude and achievement must be seen as parallel and complementary to that of his patron, not as diametrically opposed. Both of them, without destroying the essential continuity with Rome's past—the last thing either of them would want to do—integrated that past into the less provincial past of Greece. The poet who celebrated Roman *virtus* and victory, and the commander who, besides winning a war for Rome, put up Roman *Fasti* in his temple of the Muses, would be the last persons to renounce the past

of Numa and the Vestal Virgins and the sacred *ancilia*. The Muses start by explaining that they really are the Camenae—just another name for them. They do not supersede them, or oppose them, since they are the same. But in the end the Camenae must be absorbed into the Muses, just as their *aedicula* had to be absorbed into the temple structure of M. Fulvius Nobilior. Rome must make its individual contribution within the cultural framework of Greece. That was what philhellenism in Rome was really about, for those to whom it meant anything at all. And here we may fittingly take our leave of Q. Ennius and his patron.

APPENDIX: *CAELI PUGNAE*

Pliny, *NH* VII 101 says that Ennius added Book XVI to his epic in order to celebrate the exploits of T. Caecilius Teucer and his brother. This is generally, and rightly, understood to mean that Ennius had originally stopped at the end of Book XV and later took up his pen again, going on to add (in fact) three more books. What interests us is the identity and exploits of the men who caused him to do so.

Macrobius (VI 3, 3) mentions *pugnam Caeli tribuni* and quotes lines 401-8 for this battle. Since the lines describe a brave stand by a Roman against Histrians, it is natural to connect the battle with the Histrian War related in Livy, Book XLI. There, indeed, we find two tribunes called (according to our text) T. and C. Aelii prominent in the fighting (XLI 1, 7; 4, 3); although the particular exploit recorded by Ennius is not mentioned and another tribune (as was noted long ago) plays a more prominent part than the Aelii. Are any or all of these to be identified? The attempt has often been made, for two or all three, and there are difficulties, pointed out and stressed in a careful review of the evidence by Suerbaum (pp. 146-51). I accept many of his strictures against poor arguments, though I think he is at times hypercritical. (Thus, the fact that Livy does not explicitly call his Aelii brothers seems no argument at all against identification with the brothers attested by Pliny.) The case for identification has not recently been popular, no doubt in view of Vahlen's firm rejection. Although not all the difficulties can be removed, it seems to deserve reviving, basically along lines long ago sketched (though perhaps not forcefully enough) by L. Havet, *Bibl. de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes* 35 (1878), 34 f.—dismissed by Vahlen, *Ges. phil. Schriften*

II 252 f.): there is probably only one name involved, and that name is Caelius. Macrobius, as so often, has it right.

There is certainly no valid excuse for those scholars who, identifying the incidents referred to in Livy and in Macrobius, have emended Macrobius according to Livy and produced "*pugnam C. Aeli*"—an error committed by Merula and unfortunately still found in Willis's edition of Macrobius, without discussion. Our version of Livy XLI, especially for the first nine chapters, inspires no confidence. It rests on an apograph by Grynaeus from the Vindobonensis, which does not survive for these chapters. (See Giarratano's edition for a convenient summary of the facts.) Now, the Vindobonensis is full of spelling errors, especially in names, and illustration is only too easy. Wrong *praenomina* are common (e.g. XLI 14, 11; 15, 6; 17, 1; etc.); the abbreviation "Q." is expanded to "*que*" and added to the preceding word (XLI 14, 4; XLII 4, 4). Sometimes gibberish results, e.g. (XLI 28, 5) "*Ci. Furius Grassus pars*" for M. Furius Crassipes. *Nomina* are frequently distorted, e.g. "Aemilium" for "Aelium" (XLII 9, 8). Most interesting for our purpose, wrong word division (sometimes with consequential errors in "adjustment") is frequent. I quote some striking examples: XLII 22, 7 *rogationem M. Arcia* for *rogatione Marcia*; 27, 8 *Seditius* for *Sex. Digitius*; and even better 26, 7 *C. P. Laetorius* for *C. Plaetorius*. (Such inventions as *Tullium Quintium Flaminium* (XLV 44, 3) sufficiently show the scribe's standard of competence.)

In the light of these examples (and they are a small random selection) it should be clear that this text should never have been taken as a basis for emending the relatively good one of Macrobius. It might be urged that the reason for doing so is that the names concerned occur twice: hence less likelihood of repeated error. But here Havet rightly pointed out (p. 36³) that the uniformity may have been introduced by Grynaeus. It is a well-known fact that Grynaeus and other scholars of his age emended the texts they copied as they saw fit, without giving any indication of the

changes they were making. Madvig (*Emend. Liv.*² (1877), 592) put it very clearly: "nec tamen, quod illius aetatis mos minus postulabat, quid in codice repertum, quid a se profectum esset, indicaret"; and, on the first chapters of XLI (p. 601): "ita Grynaei fide nituntur ut, quid ille in codicis scriptura mutarit, nesciatur". That consistency (in correctness or error) need not be postulated for the scribe of Vindobonensis is obvious. Thus a man who in XLII 28, 5 is called L. Iunius Annalis appears *ibid.* 31, 9 as C. Iulius Annalis—both, incidentally, mistaken!—even though the fact that the same man is referred to is clear to anyone who is aware of what the text actually means. If one of the two references to T. and C. Caelii referred to them as Aelii and the other did not (whether it got the name right or introduced a different error), Grynaeus would inevitably eliminate the discrepancy.

There is, therefore, no need to emend Macrobius, and emendation must, in fact, go the other way. As for Pliny, this leaves the easy change from "Caecilius" to "Caelius" in his text. As it happens, this very confusion can be demonstrated in Pliny's text in the vicinity of our passage. In VII 165 M. Caelius Rufus, Cicero's client, is given the *nomen* Caecilius (and thus again XXVII 4); while a medical writer about whom we know nothing else appears once as Caelius Bion (XXVIII 200) and once as Caecilius (XXIX 85). And the very passage concerning the Caecilii(?) Teucris shows textual confusion over the *praenomen* of Ennius.

As to the incident itself, it was pointed out long ago by L. Mueller and confirmed by Cichorius (*Unt. Luc.* 187 f.) that Lucilius 1079 M (*Caeli pugnas*) uses an Ennian reminiscence to describe another Histrian War—that of C. Sempronius Tuditanus (*cos.* 129). This must surely be accepted, and it shows the fame gained by the description. (Lucilius' plural is obviously generic—cf. the singular in Macrobius.)

It is true that Macrobius' text does not quote the passage from Book XVI: the MSS divide evenly between XII and XV.

This, however, does show confusion and illegibility at an early stage, and there is no objection to emending that figure—and not accepting either version precisely as it stands. The change to XVI can be supported by obvious palaeographic arguments. It has been urged (most recently by Suerbaum) that Histrians appear elsewhere in Book XV, in connection with a siege (see fr. IV, from Macrobius, with no textual confusion). But it was shown long ago that the siege is probably that of Ambracia—the centrepiece of that book, as far as we can see, and the original triumphant conclusion of the whole epic. (For the evidence on the Histrians, see Vahlen, p. cxcix, referring to Florus I 26, 1, where Histrian support for the Aetolians is explicitly reported.) One could (like Vahlen) put the *Caeli pugna* in the same context and dissociate it from the Histrian War of Book XVI. This, however, is made less than plausible by Cichorius's demonstration of Lucilius' use of the phrase for a Histrian War; and since Livy offers us the "Aelii" who can so easily become Caelii, it seems to me the least difficult interpretation of the evidence to link the whole episode with the great Histrian War in Book XVI and Pliny's comment on it (no doubt from Ennius' own *prooemium*). That the reason Ennius gave for resuming his task may not be the whole truth is argued in the text above, pp. 185-7.

DISCUSSION

M. Suerbaum: Die Nepos-Notiz in der *Vita Catonis* 1, 4 scheint mir doch etwas mehr Vertrauen zu verdienen. Zu bedenken ist, dass diese Biographie nur eine Abkürzung einer ausführlicheren *Vita Catonis* ist, auf die Nepos am Schluss (3, 5) verweist. Die uns vorliegende Fassung will den Historiker Cato würdigen. Nun erscheint aber jene Ennius-Nachricht, die doch die literarischen Interessen Catos unterstützen könnte, eben nicht in dem « literarischen » Teil der *Vita* (cap. 3), sondern in dem allgemein-chronologischen Teil (cap. 1/2). Zudem ist der von Nepos berichtete Sachverhalt *praetor prouinciam obtinuit Sardiniam, ex qua quaestor superiore tempore ex Africa decedens Q. Ennium poetam deduxerat* chronologisch so kompliziert, dass man ihn kaum für eine Erfindung halten möchte; denn dann würde man eher die einfache Lösung erwarten, die Ps. Aur. Vict., *De uir. ill.* 47 — offensichtlich Nepos missverstehend, ihn jedenfalls chronologisch vereinfachend — bietet. Dort nämlich steht sinngemäss: *praetor prouinciam obtinuit Sardiniam, ex qua Ennium poetam, qui eum ibi instituerat, deduxit.* — Wenn Mr. Badian mit seiner These recht haben sollte, die Erfindung dieser Verbindung Cato/Ennius durch einen Annalisten habe eine anticatonische Tendenz, weil man Catos Kritik an Fulvius durch den Hinweis auf Catos (angebliche) eigene parallele Praxis entwerten wollte, so ist immerhin zu konstatieren, dass Nepos daraus einen strahlenden Ruhmes-titel Catos gemacht, die Tendenz also ins Gegenteil verkehrt hat: *... quod non minoris aestimamus quam quemlibet amplissimum Sardi-niensem triumphum.*

M. Jocelyn: I do not think that the absence of a reference to the story of Ennius' arrival in Rome from Sardinia at *De sen.* 10 indicates either ignorance or disbelief on Cicero's part. Cicero

was writing an imaginative dialogue for an audience (or readership if you like) which knew the stories circulating about Ennius and other early poets and did not need to be reminded of the details. He represented Cato (perhaps falsely, but no matter) as a cultivated Roman gentleman, not as some pedant anxious to give an exhaustive account of his own learning.

At *Tusc.* I 3 Cicero is talking about the ill repute of poets in early Rome. The fact (if it is a fact) that Cato brought the man Ennius to Rome with him fifteen years or so before has no relevance. There was no reason at all why it should have been mentioned.

The next great orator after Cethegus was Cato. It is not therefore surprising that at *Brut.* 60 Cicero should remark the fact that Cato was quaestor in the year Cethegus was consul. Such synchronisms were common in ancient literary histories. Ennius would hardly have referred to a quaestorship in the *Annals*.

M. Badian: The *Brutus* passage is (as I said) marginal: one could argue as Mr. Jocelyn has done, that Cato's quaestorship is mentioned in 60 because he is the next great orator to be treated (61 f.). One could also argue that, in view of that immediate treatment to follow, reference to the quaestorship was unnecessary—and note that in the whole of the *Brutus* no other quaestorship is mentioned for such a purpose. At *Tusc.* I, 3 ff. Cicero mentions Cato's attack on Fulvius "for taking poets to his province" and takes care to explain that, *ut scimus*, the poet concerned was Ennius. It is at least odd that he fails to add that (equally *ut scimus*, on Professor Jocelyn's view) Cato had actually "taken the poet from a province to Rome"; the more so as in 5 he proceeds to describe Cato as *studiosum*. In *Cato de sen.* 10 Cato is an old man reminiscing about his youth, and (as I said) quoting his *familiaris* Ennius. He also mentions his quaestorship. I cannot see why he should refrain from saying that (*ut scitis*, if you like) he had brought the poet to Rome in

that office. One such omission might be ignored, or explained away. Three seem to me decisive. As for Mr. Suerbaum's question, I think it far more likely that Cicero knew the story and ignored it as gossip, perhaps because he had found it in a bad source.

M. Jocelyn : I do not think that Ennius would have singled out for special prominence even the deeds of Cato's consulship. The *Annals*, it is commonly agreed, were written under the patronage of Fulvius Nobilior.

M. Badian : Cicero in the *Pro Archia* says so and we have no reason to deny it : Cicero and his educated audience knew their Ennius. As I have often said elsewhere : one must not think of Roman social and political life in terms of " parties " and " party " loyalties. Ennius legitimately could, and did, keep out of these *inimicitiae*.

M. Jocelyn : I do not deny that Ennius described Cato's military achievements. Cicero, *Arch.* 22, however, merely lists Cato among other successful generals eulogized in the *Annals*.

M. Skutsch : I wonder whether Professor Badian could explain why Porcius Licinus should know of Ennius' earlier habitat. Would it not be more natural to assume that he knew where he lived later when he had risen in the world?

M. Badian : Yes ; though if there were two locations, I do not see why he should not know of both ; and if he did, he might choose (for his polemical point) to stress the first and (necessarily) less comfortable one. However : I am by no means committed to the view that Ennius did move house, or that he ever lived near the *loca Tutilinae*.

M. Jocelyn : Is it likely that an immigrant with a sophisticated Greek education paid attention to an obscure local deity like the *dea Tutilina*?

M. Badian : If the text says so, it is a fact we have to accept. I admit it is uncertain, but unless we emend it, this does seem to be what it says. Since we know practically nothing about *Tutilina*, except that she was a very old goddess, we cannot even try to guess whether or why Ennius should or should not feel specially interested in her.

M. Skutsch : The multiple transposition of *Ann.* 628, to produce so improbable an hexameter as—○○—*in campo apud emporium pro moene hostium* seems to me unconvincing, although I fully see that the context suggested by Prof. Badian is excellent.

This was followed by a general discussion of this line, and Prof. Badian repeated that his reconstruction was given only exempli gratia.

As to the identification of Galba, I have the feeling that if Cicero had meant the younger Galba he would have said *cum Galba adulescentulo*, provided he knew that it was the younger Galba.

M. Jocelyn : The story of Ennius and Nasica seems to me too neat to be literally true. It is perhaps a floating anecdote which attached itself to Ennius and Nasica. The fact that Cicero reports it is no warranty. In the philosophical dialogues Cicero often used stories which men of education and good manners were given to relating. The truth or falsehood of such stories did not concern him.

M. Badian : On Galba, it seems to me pretty certain (from the form of Cicero's quotation) that Ennius told the story ; also, since Cicero always does mean the great orator by this form of reference, I think he did in this case. I doubt whether he sufficiently checked the chronology to realize that Galba would be *adulescens*. I repeat that, if Cicero thought so, it does not follow that it was true. But I think my point from social conventions supports it (though less so than in the case of Nasica), and there is nothing improbable in Ennius' taking a walk with a young

pupil. As for Nasica, I can only say that we know Cicero takes great care over the historical background and does not retail mere gossip (e.g. the Cato story). Also, I cannot imagine why a man like P. Scipio Nasica, of all people, and not one of the great men of the age, should be chosen as the hero of this story, if it were really no more than a floating anecdote.

M. Suerbaum: Ist das anmassende Verhalten des Ennius gegenüber Scipio Nasica in Ciceros Zeit naheliegend? Doch offenbar nicht. Deshalb möchte man erwarten, dass die Anekdote keine Erfindung der ciceronischen Zeit ist, sondern einen historischen Kern hat.

M. Waszink: What must the words *haece locutus* in *Ann.* 234 refer to?

M. Badian: I should think the consul has been addressing his *consilium* and now withdraws to talk to his friend.

M. Skutsch: It seems to me that the phrase *inter pugnas* is fully explained by the deliberate contrast of the second line of the fragment. *Epulae* and *bellum* are used as contrasting spheres of life both by Ennius himself, *Sc.* 314: *scibam me in mortiferum bellum, non in epulas mittere*, and by Petron. *V* 22: *dent epulas et bella*.

M. Suerbaum: Bei der Interpretation von *Ann.* 234-251 sollte man den Gegensatz zwischen dem vorhergehenden Handeln des Servilius (*haece locutus* weist auf eine Ansprache) und dem jetzigen Geschehen, der Aussprache mit einem « guten Gefährten », stärker berücksichtigen. Die Beschreibung des « guten Gefährten » ist zwar allgemein gehalten; sie hat aber an dieser Stelle nur einen Sinn, wenn ihre Aussagen auch für die jetzige Situation *inter pugnas* passen. Nach diesem methodischen Grundsatz muss Servilius *zuvor* in einer Weise beansprucht worden sein, die eine Parallele zu einem harten Verhandlungstag im Senat bilden kann, d.h. — wenn man *locutus* und *inter pugnas* berücksichtigt — Servilius muss eine Ansprache im Kriegsrat oder (weniger wahrscheinlich) vor den Soldaten gehalten haben. Jetzt aber wendet

sich Servilius seinem Vertrauten zu. Wenn die Beschreibung des sonstigen entspannenden Verkehrs mit ihm einen Sinn haben soll, muss sie auch für die jetzige Szene gelten, von der wir nur den Auftakt (234 *uocat*, 251 *hunc inter pugnas Seruilius sic compellat*) kennen. Das Milieu des sonst gepflegten Umganges ist offensichtlich der Abend, *otium*. Deshalb scheint mir die jetzt anhebende Szene in der Tat am besten für den Abend eines Kampftages zu passen, an dem der Feldherr sich im Gespräch mit seinem Vertrauten entspannt oder auch — was ebenfalls nicht ausgeschlossen ist, wenn man *cui res audacter magnas ... eloqueretur* bedenkt, — offen über den Ernst der augenblicklichen Lage *inter pugnas* (zwischen zwei Kampftagen) ausspricht. Die sich abzeichnende Szene braucht — entsprechend der Schilderung des typischen Verhaltens — mehr Zeit, als ein *inter pugnas* im Sinne von « während einer Kampfpause an einem Schlachttag » einräumen würde.

M. Waszink: Ich kann der Meinung von Herrn Suerbaum nicht beipflichten: der Gebrauch des Verbums *compellat* lässt mich vermuten, dass es sich in der jetzt gegebenen Situation um eine recht kurze Mitteilung oder auch um eine Bitte handelt.

M. Skutsch: The prominence given by Silius Italicus to Servilius and his glorious death at Cannae (X 222 ff. *Seruilius optima belli, post Paullum belli pars optima, corruit ictu barbarico magnamque cadens leto addidit uno inuidiam Cannis*; cf. VIII 665; IX 272; XVII 308) makes it in my judgement impossible to imagine that the Servilius mentioned by Gellius should not be the Servilius thus celebrated.

M. Badian: Silius uses material not in Livy and probably read some of the late annalists — perhaps more often than we can prove, since Livy used them himself. The legend of Cn. Servilius' exploits at Cannae is not in Livy, but is in Appian's *Hannibalic War*, hence was in some late annalist. There is no reason to think that Silius is here based on Ennius.

Let me finally repeat that it is not enough to show that Cannae and Cn. Servilius will fit (though even this, I think, is still very much open to question). Those who want to change a book number in a practically perfect source have to show that the change is not only possible, but necessary and indeed inevitable. I do not see that anyone has come anywhere near showing this.

M. Jocelyn: I am not persuaded that Aelius Stilo might have drawn from an oral tradition of the Servilii the idea that in describing the general's companion at *Ann.* 234-51 Ennius gave a portrait of himself. It was an old scholarly game to find in poetic texts concealed references to the poet and his contemporaries (cf. *Schol. ad Eur. Orest.* 772; 903). The rules of this game were very elastic.

M. Suerbaum: Mit Mr. Jocelyn glaube ich, dass die Bezeichnung der Charakteristik des « guten Gefährten », *Ann.* 234-51, als indirektes Selbstporträt des Ennius eine philologische Interpretation ist, für die Aelius Stilo nicht aus einer hypothetischen Familientradition der Servilier zu schöpfen brauchte. Dass Ennius einem Mitglied der Familie der Servilier erklärt haben sollte, er habe sich in dem « guten Gefährten » selber abbilden und damit den Serviliern ein Kompliment machen wollen, ist eine eigenartige Vorstellung. Dass er ein indirektes Selbstporträt geben wollte, ist möglich, bei dem Umfang der historisch an sich bedeutungslosen Szene sogar wahrscheinlich. Wichtig ist, dass jedenfalls Aelius Stilo von dem Charakter und der sozialen Stellung des Ennius eine Vorstellung hatte, wie er sie in *Ann.* 234-51 konkret dargestellt fand.

M. Badian: One naturally cannot prove, against those who choose not to believe it, that Aelius Stilo had genuine information. I was merely concerned to show one way in which genuine information might have reached him. I cannot agree with Professor Suerbaum's suggestion that it is somehow absurd to think of Ennius' and his patron's discussing his poetry and of

this as giving rise to some genuine oral tradition about it. This has happened in the case of many other poets, ancient and modern.

M. Untermann : Bezüglich der Frage, wie Ennius zu seinem Vornamen *Quintus* gekommen sei, möchte ich darauf hinweisen, dass es einigermassen sicher ist, dass der messapische Vorname *daximas* « decimus » bedeutet. Man darf also annehmen, dass die Messapier, ebenso wie die Römer und Osko-Umbrer, Ordinalzahlen als Namen kannten. Ennius' einheimischer Vorname könnte somit lateinisch *Quintus* entsprochen haben ; leider können wir keinen der erhaltenen messapischen Namen mit Sicherheit mit dem Zahlwort « fünf » verbinden ; man vergleiche allenfalls *penkeos* (Gen. sg.), das mit idg. *penq^{te}* (gr. πέντε) zusammengebracht werden könnte. Er kann also seinen einheimischen Namen durch dessen lateinische Entsprechung ersetzt haben, sobald er in näheren Kontakt mit Römern kam.

M. Suerbaum : Spekulationen, die die verschiedenen Nachrichten über die Aelii, Caelii oder Caecilii auf ein einziges Brüderpaar beziehen, habe ich in meinen *Untersuchungen* (S. 148 ff.) besprochen und abgelehnt. Wenn nur im XVI. Buch der *Annalen* vom Istrier-Krieg und den Heldentaten der Brüder Caelii die Rede war, wie sind dann die beiden Istrier-Erwähnungen im XV. Buch (*Ann.* XV fr. IV und 408) zu erklären?

M. Badian : It was suggested long ago that, since at *Sat.* VI 3, 1 the main manuscripts of Macrobius are evenly divided between XII and XV (three each), the original had obviously become illegible in detail, and emendation to XVI is justified if there is good reason for it. (This accounts for *Ann.* XV 401 sqq.). As for XV fr. IV, Vahlen showed that the siege is probably that of Ambracia, with the Histrians there as mercenaries (compare Florus I 26, 1).

M. Waszink : One remark with regard to this "reconciliation" of *Musae* and *Camena*e : I regard it as certain that Ennius only

wants to show or to underline the *identity* of these groups of goddesses. More than once in the *Annals* he mentions a Greek word together with its Latin translation (148 *uentus aer*; 218 *sophia-sapientia*). Let us not forget in this context how extremely important Ennius thought his knowledge of more than one language, which for him was much less self-evident than it is for us; it is in this light that we should see his statement about his *tria corda*.

M. Jocelyn: Like Mr. Badian I find quite incredible the common notion that Ennius displayed in the *Annals* a degree of contempt for the *Camena*e, goddesses who figured prominently in the legend of Numa, the founder of the pontifical college. An idea strikes me which I shall probably dismiss on further reflection, namely that the *dea Tutilina* was one of the *Camena*e. There were legends in which the *Camena*e were individualized, e.g. that of Egeria.